Health Canada Santé Canada

*Your health and safety... our priority.* *Votre santé et votre sécurité... notre priorité.*

Re-evaluation Decision RVD2016-02

# Carbaryl

*(publié aussi en français)*

**31 March 2016**

This document is published by the Health Canada Pest Management Regulatory Agency. For further information, please contact:

Publications
Pest Management Regulatory Agency
Health Canada
2720 Riverside Drive
A.L. 6607 D
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K9pmra.infoserv@hc-sc.gc.ca

Internet: pmra.publications@hc-sc.gc.ca
healthcanada.gc.ca/pmra
Facsimile: 613-736-3758
Information Service:
1-800-267-6315 or 613-736-3799

Canada

ISSN: 1925-1017 (print)
1925-1025 (online)

Catalogue number: H113-28/2016-2E (print version)
H113-28/2016-2E-PDF (PDF version)

**© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, represented by the Minister of Health Canada, 2016**

All rights reserved. No part of this information (publication or product) may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in a retrieval system, without prior written permission of the Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5.

# Table of Contents


Re-evaluation Decision for Carbaryl ..... 3
What Does Health Canada Consider When Making a Re-evaluation Decision? ..... 4
What is Carbaryl? ..... 5
Health Considerations ..... 5
Environmental Considerations ..... 10
Value Considerations ..... 11
Incident Reports ..... 11
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Status of Carbaryl ..... 11
Measures to Minimize Risk ..... 12
Other Information ..... 13
Appendix I Comments and Responses ..... 17
1.0 Comments Related to the Health Risk Assessments ..... 17
1.1 Toxicology ..... 17
1.1.1 Refinement of the 3-fold Uncertainty Factor to 1.8-fold ..... 20
1.1.2 Intraspecies Differences in Neurodevelopment ..... 20
1.1.3 No Fetal Sensitivity to Brain Cholinesterase Effects in Sufficient and Available Studies ..... 21
1.2 Comments Related to Residential and Occupational Exposure ..... 22
1.2.1 Comments relating to the Human Health Risk Assessment for Agricultural Uses ..... 23
1.2.2 Comments Relating to the Human Health Risk Assessment for Turf Use ..... 28
1.2.3 Comments Relating to the Human Health Risk Assessment for Apple Thinning ..... 30
1.3 Comments Relating to the Dietary Risk Assessment ..... 31
2.0 Comments Related to the Environmental Risk Assessments ..... 33
2.1 Effects on Aquatic Organisms ..... 33
2.2 Aerial Buffer Zone Calculations ..... 34
2.3 Buffer Zone for Tobacco ..... 35
2.4 Buffer Zones for the Use of Carbaryl on Apple ..... 35
2.5 Bee Precaution Statement ..... 35
3.0 Comments Pertaining to the Value Assessment ..... 36
3.1 Use of Carbaryl on Apples ..... 36
3.2 Use of Carbaryl on Turf ..... 38
3.3 Use of Carbaryl in the Ornamental Landscape Industry and in Forestry for the Control of Mountain Pine Beetle ..... 41
3.4 Carbaryl Use on Tobacco ..... 42
3.5 Carbaryl Use on Grape ..... 42
3.6 Carbaryl use for the control of (striped) cucumber beetle and climbing cutworms on cucumber, melon, pumpkin and squash ..... 43
3.7 Carbaryl use on cole crops (broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage, cauliflower, and kohlrabi) ..... 43
3.8 Carbaryl Use in Residential Areas and the Impact on Agriculture from the Rural and Urban Interface ..... 44
3.9 Carbaryl Use on Cherry ..... 45
3.10 Carbaryl Use on Carrot ..... 46
Appendix II Registered Carbaryl Products as of November 2015[1] ..... 47

Appendix III – Revised Mixer/Loader/Applicator Exposure Estimates ..... 51
Table III.1 Revised M/L/A Exposure Estimates and ARI Using Updated Application Rates for Uses to Be Cancelled ..... 51
Table III.2 Revised M/L/A Exposure Estimates and ARIs using Updated Application Rates for Uses to be Retained ..... 52
Appendix IV Revised Postapplication Exposure Estimates ..... 53
Table IV.1 Revised Postapplication Exposure Estimates, MOEs and REIs based on Updated Use Information for Uses to be Cancelled ..... 53
Table IV.2 .....Revised Postapplication Exposure Estimates, MOEs and REIs for Uses to be Retained ..... 56
Table IV.3 ...Worker Postapplication Exposure and MOEs on Sod Farm and Golf Course Turfs ..... 61
Appendix V Label Amendments for Commercial Class Products Containing Carbaryl ..... 62
Appendix VI Additional Mitigation Measures for Certain Products Containing Carbaryl ... 75
References ..... 76

## Re-evaluation Decision for Carbaryl

After a thorough re-evaluation of the insecticide carbaryl, Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA), under the authority of the *Pest Control Products Act* and Regulations, is granting continued registration of certain products containing carbaryl for sale and use in Canada.

An evaluation of available scientific information found that, under the revised conditions of use:

- Certain uses of carbaryl products have value in Canada and do not pose unacceptable risks to human health or the environment. These uses include commercial products applied in agricultural, non-crop and forestry settings, other than those noted below. As a requirement for continued registration of these carbaryl uses, new risk reduction measures are required No additional data are requested at this time.

- Certain uses of carbaryl must be removed from the current carbaryl labels because they are not supported by the technical registrant. These uses are as follows and were not included in the risk assessment:

    - Indoor pest control uses including greenhouses, residences, food and feed handling establishments and barns and livestock production areas
    - Aerosol products
    - Agricultural dust uses
    - Bran bait application to residential garden
    - Livestock for food
    - Livestock for non-food
    - Companion animals
    - Granular bait products for ornamental gardens
    - Applications by hand, spoon and bellygrinder

- Certain products or uses pose risks of concern to human health and do not meet Health Canada's current standards for human health protection. As a result, the following products or uses will be cancelled:

    - All domestic class products
    - Commercial application of carbaryl in residential settings including ornamentals, vegetable gardens and fruit trees in residential areas
    - All turf applications in commercial and residential areas, including lawns, sod farms and golf courses
    - Various crops (alfalfa, apples (insecticide use), apricot, barley, broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage, cauliflower, cherries, clover, corn (sweet & field), grapes, kale, oats, peach, pears, peppers, plums, prunes, rye, snapbeans (hand harvest only), strawberries, sweet white lupin, wheat); and
    - Balsam fir, spruce, farm woodlots, municipal parks and rights-of-way for control of spruce budworm.

The PMRA's pesticide re-evaluation program considers potential risks as well as the value of pesticide products to ensure they meet modern standards established to protect human health and the environment. Regulatory Directive DIR2001-03, *PMRA Re-evaluation Program*, presents the details of the re-evaluation activities and program structure. Re-evaluation draws on data from registrants, published scientific reports, information from other regulatory agencies, and any other relevant information available.

The regulatory approach for the re-evaluation of carbaryl was first presented in Proposed Re-evaluation Decision PRVD2009-14, *Carbaryl*[1]. This Re-evaluation Decision[2] describes this stage of PMRA's regulatory process for the re-evaluation of carbaryl and summarizes the Agency's decision and the reasons for it.

Comments received during the consultation process were taken into consideration. These comments and new data/information resulted in revisions to some parts of the risk assessments, however, did not result in substantial changes to the proposed regulatory decision as described in PRVD2009-14. Appendix I of this document summarizes comments received and provides the PMRA's response.

To comply with this decision, the following implementation timelines must be followed. Registrants of end-use products containing carbaryl will be informed of the specific requirements affecting their product registration(s) and of the regulatory options available to them.

1) Label changes: The required mitigation measures (Appendix V) must be implemented on all commercial product labels sold by registrants as soon as possible but no later than 24 months after the publication date of this document.

2) Domestic products: The last sale of all domestic products by Registrants and Retailers is 12 months and 24 months following the publication date of this document, respectively. The registration of these products will expire 36 months following the publication date of this document (Appendix VI).

3) Water soluble packaging requirements: An application to register a new product in water soluble packaging is required within 24 months following the publication date of this document (Appendix VI).

## What Does Health Canada Consider When Making a Re-evaluation Decision?

The key objective of the *Pest Control Products Act* is to prevent risks of concern to people and the environment from the use of pest control products. Health or environmental risk is considered of no concern if there is reasonable certainty that no harm to human health, future generations or the environment will result from use or exposure to the product under its conditions or proposed conditions of registration.[3] The Act also requires that products have

1 "Consultation statement" as required by subsection 28(2) of the *Pest Control Products Act*.
2 "Decision statement" as required by subsection 28(5) of the *Pest Control Products Act*.
3 "Acceptable risks" as defined by subsection 2(2) of the *Pest Control Products Act*.

value[4] when used according to the label directions. Requirements of continued registration may include special precautionary measures on the product label to further reduce risk.

To reach its decisions, the PMRA applies hazard and risk assessment methods as well as policies that are rigorous and modern. These methods consider the unique characteristics of sensitive populations subgroups in both humans (for example, children) and organisms in the environment (for example, those most sensitive to environmental contaminants). These methods and policies also consider the nature of the effects observed and the uncertainties present when predicting the impact of pesticides. For more information, please refer to the following sections of the Pesticides and Pest Management portion of the Health Canada website at healthcanada.gc.ca/pmra:

- Protecting Your Health and the Environment
- Pesticide Registration Process
- Pesticide Risk Reduction Program

## What is Carbaryl?

Carbaryl is a broad spectrum Resistance Management Group 1A (carbamate) insecticide. In Canada, it is registered to control a wide range of arthropod pests including beetles, moths, fleas, flies, lice, mites, sawflies, crickets, earwigs, grasshoppers, millipedes, sow bugs, thrips, ticks and cockroaches. It is also registered for use in apple thinning.

Carbaryl is used on both agricultural and non-agricultural sites including feed crops, industrial oil seed and fibre crops, livestock, greenhouse tobacco seedlings, companion animals, structures, forestry, food crops, turf, lawns and ornamentals. It is applied by both ground and aerial equipment.

## Health Considerations

### Can Approved Uses of Carbaryl Affect Human Health?

**Carbaryl is unlikely to affect human health when used according to the revised label directions, which include additional risk-reduction measures.**

Potential exposure to carbaryl may occur through the diet (food and water), by applying the product or by entering treated sites. When assessing health risks, two key factors are considered: the dose at which no health effects occur and the levels to which people may be exposed. The dose levels used to assess risks are established to protect the most sensitive human population (for example, children and nursing mothers).

---

[4] "Value" as defined by subsection 2(1) of the *Pest Control Products Act*: "the product's actual or potential contribution to pest management, taking into account its conditions or proposed conditions of registration, and includes the product's (a) efficacy; (b) effect on host organisms in connection with which it is intended to be used; and (c) health, safety and environmental benefits and social and economic impact".

Toxicology studies on laboratory animals describe potential health effects from varying levels of exposure to a chemical and identify the dose at which no effects are observed. The health effects noted in animals occur at doses more than 100-times higher (and often much higher) than levels to which humans are normally exposed when carbaryl products are used according to label directions.

The acute toxicity of carbaryl ranged from moderate to high via the oral route of exposure. It was of low acute toxicity via the dermal and inhalation routes of exposure. Carbaryl was mildly irritating to eyes, but non-irritating to skin and not a skin sensitizer.

Registrant-supplied short, and long term (lifetime) animal toxicity tests, as well as information from the published scientific literature were assessed for the potential of carbaryl to cause neurotoxicity, immunotoxicity, chronic toxicity, cancer, reproductive and developmental toxicity, and various other effects. The most sensitive endpoints for risk assessment included effects on the nervous system. In addition, there was evidence that young animals were more sensitive than adult animals to carbaryl toxicity as demonstrated by the effects on the nervous system at lower levels than adults. Longer-term dosing with carbaryl resulted in tumors of the blood in mice.

Only those uses where exposure is well below levels that cause no effects in animal testing are considered acceptable for registration.

**Risks in Residential and Other Non-Occupational Environments**

**Residential uses of carbaryl on turf, ornamentals, fruit trees and vegetable gardens are of concern. These uses will be cancelled.**

Carbaryl is registered for use on turf, and on residential ornamental and vegetable gardens. Estimates of exposure using turf transferable residue data and dislodgeable foliar data, as well as carbaryl specific biomonitoring data did not achieve the target margin of exposure (MOE) and/or aggregate risk index for adults and children for all postapplication exposure scenarios and some application scenarios, and are therefore of concern. Risks of concern remained even after consideration of all feasible mitigation measures.

As a result, all residential uses of carbaryl must be cancelled. This includes cancellation of all domestic-class products and commercial applications in residential areas. Applications on turf, golf courses, ornamentals, vegetable gardens and fruit trees in residential areas will not be permitted. Residential areas are defined as sites where bystanders including children could be exposed during or after application. This includes homes, schools, public buildings or any other areas where the general public including children could be exposed.

As described in PRVD2009-14, carbaryl is currently registered in use scenarios that could potentially include Pick-Your-Own (PYO) operations. When the updated use refinements, product discontinuations and risk mitigation measures are taken into account, aggregate exposure for PYO patrons is not of concern.

Cancer risks are not of concern to any residential population for the remaining uses of carbaryl.

**Occupational Risks from Handling Carbaryl**

**Mixer/Loader/Applicator**

**The majority of risks for mixers, loaders and applicators are not of concern provided additional mitigation measures are followed.**

Occupational risk assessments from handling carbaryl consider exposure to workers who mix, load, and apply the pesticide. Most uses for agricultural scenarios have margins of exposure that are not of concern, provided that engineering controls or personal protective equipment are used. These measures are needed to minimize potential exposure and protect workers' health.

All non-cancer risk estimates for lawn care operators applying carbaryl to residential turf, as well as for golf course and sod farm workers applying carbaryl, did not reach the target margin of exposure and/or aggregate risk index for broadcast treatments, even with maximum personal protective equipment and engineering controls, and are therefore of concern. These uses must be cancelled.

Risks of concern were identified in PRVD2009-14 for agricultural workers using hand held equipment. However, with the updated use refinements, product discontinuations and risk mitigation measures taken into account, occupational risk from the use of hand held equipment is no longer of concern.

The mixer/loader/applicator risk assessment for carbaryl was revised for tobacco and canola, based on new data and updated use information provided by registrants and stakeholders during the comment period for PRVD2009-14. Mitigation options proposed by registrants and stakeholders were also carefully considered. These data and the revised risk assessment are presented in Appendix III. With the risk mitigation, the exposure during mixing, loading and applying for tobacco and canola reach target MOEs and are not of concern.

For other uses, while the additional information resulted in a more accurate risk assessment and more refined mitigation measures for certain uses, the overall risk conclusions did not change significantly from those presented in PRVD2009-14. As occupational mixer/loader/applicator risks of concern for certain uses could not be addressed, the following uses must be cancelled:

> alfalfa, barley, broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage, cauliflower, cherries, clover, oats, pears, peppers, plums, rye, strawberries and wheat.

Cancer risks are not of concern to mixers, loaders or applicators for the remaining uses of carbaryl.

**Postapplication Workers**

**Most occupational postapplication risks are not of concern based on revised label directions. Risks for certain uses could not be mitigated and must be cancelled.**

Post-application risk assessments consider exposure to workers entering treated areas. The postapplication risk assessment for carbaryl was revised based on new data and updated use information provided by registrants and stakeholders during the comment period for PRVD2009-14. Mitigation options proposed by registrants and stakeholders were also carefully considered. These data and the revised risk assessment are presented in AppendixIV.

Target MOEs for certain uses of carbaryl are achieved when revised conditions of use and risk reductions measures, such as increased restricted-entry intervals (REIs), are considered. The revised conditions of use are presented in Appendix V. The uses acceptable for continued registration are:

> Asparagus and asparagus ferns, beans, beet (root/top), blueberries, bran bait applications (non-residential), cane berries, canola, carrots, celery, choke cherries, cranberries, cucumbers, ditch banks, eggplants, forests and woodlots, green ash, high value trees, horseradish, kohlrabi, leafy vegetables, melons, ornamental trees, parsnips, peas, potatoes, pumpkins, rutabaga (root), salsify (root/top), snapbeans (mechanical harvest), squash, trap trees, tobacco, tomatoes and turnip (root/top).

For other uses, while the additional information resulted in an exposure assessment that may more accurately reflect typical use conditions, the overall risk conclusions did not change significantly from those presented in PRVD2009-14. As postapplication risks of concern could not be addressed through agronomically feasible REIs, the following uses must be cancelled:

> alfalfa, apples (for insect control), apricot, barley, broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage, cauliflower, cherries, clover, corn (sweet & field), grapes, kale, oats, peach, pears, plums, prunes, rye, snapbeans (hand harvest only), strawberries, sweet white lupin, wheat, balsam fir, spruce, farm woodlots, municipal parks and rights-of-way for control of spruce budworm.

Cancer risks are not of concern to postapplication workers for the remaining uses of carbaryl.

**The use of carbaryl for apple thinning is unlikely to be of concern for postapplication workers when used in accordance with the revised label directions.**

The risk assessment for the apple thinning use was revised and refined based on updated use information, revised application rates, and other information provided by registrants and stakeholders. Information on modern apple orchard production indicated that the majority of apple orchards have transitioned to high density plantings (or are in the process of transitioning). Postapplication exposure to workers is expected to be lower with high density trellis plantings than with standard trees. Revised conditions of use for apple thinning have been developed as follows to reflect use in high density apple orchards as well as for standard orchard plantings:

For orchards that have transitioned to high density trellis production architecture (for example, spindle or super spindle trees):

- Maximum seasonal rate of 1.5 kg a.i./ha and an REI of 14 days for hand thinning

For orchards that have not transitioned to high density trellis production architecture (for example, dwarf, semi-dwarf and full sized trees):

- Maximum seasonal rate of 1 kg a.i./ha and an REI of 17 days for hand thinning

Additional label amendments described in Appendix V must also be implemented as required.

**Residues in Food and Water**

**Dietary risks from food and water are not of concern when risk reduction measures are implemented.**

Reference doses define levels to which an individual can be exposed over a single day (acute) or lifetime (chronic) and expect no adverse health effects. Generally, dietary exposure from food and water is not of concern if it is less than 100% of the acute reference dose or chronic reference dose (acceptable daily intake). An acceptable daily intake is an estimate of the level of daily exposure to a pesticide residue that, over a lifetime, is believed to have no significant harmful effects.

Human exposure to carbaryl was estimated from residues in treated crops and drinking water, including the most highly exposed sub-populations (for example, infants and children one to six years old). Data from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, the United States Department of Agriculture Pesticide Data Program (USDA PDP), field trials, processing factors and percent crop treated (%CT) were used to estimate residue levels. As well, information on drinking water was used to estimate both the acute and chronic (non-cancer and cancer) aggregate exposures and risks.

Short term (acute), long term (chronic) and lifetime cancer exposure estimates were determined for different sub-populations representing different ages, genders and reproductive status. The maximum degree of refinement possible, based on all available information, was used in both the non-cancer and cancer dietary assessments.

As noted in PRVD2009-14, aggregate dietary exposure to carbaryl (that is, from food and drinking water) represented 2% of the chronic reference dose, while the lifetime cancer risk estimate was $7 \times 10^{-6}$ for the general population. As a result, chronic and cancer risks were not of concern. However, the acute aggregate dietary exposure estimate for carbaryl was 117% and 393% of the acute reference dose for the general population and all infants, respectively, when using drinking water inputs based on modelling data. This represented a potential risk of concern for acute dietary exposure.

The acute aggregate dietary assessment in PRVD2009-19 was updated to reflect the revised use pattern. Previously the drinking water assessment included carbaryl applications to turf. However, since the use of carbaryl on residential turf, golf courses and sod farms is to be cancelled due to residential and occupational risk concerns, the drinking water modelling is now based on carbaryl applications to field crops. As a result, the revised acute aggregate dietary exposure for carbaryl is 81% of the acute reference dose for the general population, and ranges from 31 to 107% for the various population subgroups. The highest exposure at 107% occurs for all infants and is not of concern due to conservative (high-end) assumptions in the exposure assessment, attributable primarily to the use of water modelling data to estimate drinking water exposures.

The *Food and Drugs Act* prohibits the sale of adulterated food, that is, food containing a pesticide residue that exceeds the established maximum residue limit (MRL). While pesticide MRLs are specified through the evaluation of scientific data under the *Pest Control Products Act*, the MRLs for carbaryl were established under the *Food and Drugs Act*. Each MRL value defines the maximum concentration in parts per million (ppm) of a pesticide allowed in/on certain foods. Food containing a pesticide residue that does not exceed the established MRL does not pose an unacceptable health risk.

MRLs for carbaryl are currently specified for a wide range of commodities (MRL database http://pr-rp.hc-sc.gc.ca/mrl-lmr/index-eng.php). Where no specific MRL has been established, a default MRL of 0.1 ppm applies, which means that pesticide residues in a food commodity must not exceed 0.1 ppm.

The MRLs for barley, oats and rye will be revoked following the cancellation of the associated uses in Canada. As there are no American tolerances or Codex MRLs for these uses, this action will not impact trade.

## Environmental Considerations

### What Happens When Carbaryl is Introduced into the Environment?

**When used according to the revised label directions, carbaryl is not expected to pose risk of concern to the environment.**

When carbaryl is released into the environment some of it can be found in soil and surface water. Carbaryl is quickly broken down by soil microbes and by chemical reaction in water and is not expected to persist in the environment. Although laboratory studies indicate that carbaryl is mobile in soil, field studies suggest carbaryl is broken down quickly and is unlikely to reach groundwater.

Under controlled laboratory conditions, carbaryl can be toxic to some non-target species, such as bees, beneficial insects, birds, wild mammals, aquatic invertebrates and fish. If carbaryl is used at labelled application rates without any risk reduction measures, it has the potential to cause adverse effects in the organisms listed above. Therefore, mitigation measures are required in order to reduce potential exposure of non-target organisms and reduce environmental risks.

When carbaryl is used in accordance with the revised label and the required risk reduction measures are applied, the resulting environmental risk posed by carbaryl is considered to be acceptable.

## Value Considerations

### What is the Value of Carbaryl?

**Carbaryl contributes to insect pest management in agriculture, forestry and ornamental production in Canada.**

In Canada, carbaryl is used extensively and is integral to the management of insect pests in many crops, forestry and ornamental production. It is the only registered active ingredient in Canada for the control of certain insect pests.

Carbaryl contributes to sustainable pest management by playing an important role in prevention of the development of insecticide resistance when used in rotation with insecticides of different modes of action.

Carbaryl is also used to thin apples. The thinning of developing fruit is a critical step in the economical production of apples as it results in larger apples of higher quality. Of the registered chemicals for apple thinning, carbaryl is considered the most versatile and effective thinning agent for growers to use. Carbaryl is used alone or in combination with one of the following:

- naphthalene acetic acid (NAA) marketed as Fruitone-N; or
- benzyladenine (BA) marketed as Accel, MaxCel and Cilta.

## Incident Reports

As of 30 July 2015, the Incident Reporting Program has received 49 human, 79 domestic animal and 13 environment incidents for carbaryl. Most incidents were minor in severity. All but a few of the human and domestic animal incidents involved the use of domestic class products. The discontinuation of such uses should reduce the occurrence of future incidents involving carbaryl. There was one major environment incident in which fish were killed when water that was used to extinguish a chemical warehouse fire was released into a nearby stream. The remaining environment incidents were minor in severity and involved plant damage or honeybee mortality. Honeybee mortality was reported in five of the incidents; however, other chemical active ingredients in addition to carbaryl were also reported.

## Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Status of Carbaryl

Canada is part of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which provides a forum in which governments of member countries can work together to share experiences and seek solutions to common problems.

As part of the re-evaluation of an active ingredient, the PMRA takes into consideration of recent developments and new information on the status of the active ingredient in other jurisdictions, including OECD member countries.

Carbaryl is currently registered in some OECD countries, including the United States, Australia and New Zealand.

The European Commission prohibited the use of carbaryl as a plant protection product in 2007 for health and environmental reasons. Therefore, pursuant to subsection 17(2) of the *Pest Control Products Act*, the PMRA has initiated a special review of pest control products containing carbaryl based on the 2007 European Commission decision (REV2013-06). The PMRA will publish its proposed special review decision once completed.

## Measures to Minimize Risk

Registered pesticide product labels include specific instructions for use. Directions include risk-reduction measures to protect human and environmental health. These directions must be followed by law. Appendix II lists all current products containing carbaryl. Further risk-reduction measures are required to address potential risks of concern identified in this assessment (Appendices V and VI). The following key risk-reduction measures are required.

### Key Risk-Reduction Measures

#### Human Health

After consideration of all possible mitigation measures, the following uses must be cancelled due to residential and/or occupational risk concerns:

- All domestic class products
- Commercial application of carbaryl in residential settings including ornamentals, vegetable gardens and fruit trees in residential areas
- All turf applications in commercial and residential areas, including sod farms and golf courses
- Various crops (alfalfa, apples (for insect control), apricot, barley, broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage, cauliflower, cherries, clover, corn (sweet & field), grapes, kale, oats, peach, pears, peppers, plums, prunes, rye, snapbeans (hand harvest only), strawberries, sweet white lupin, wheat, Balsam fir, spruce, farm woodlots, municipal parks and rights-of-way for control of spruce budworm.

For all other uses, to protect mixer/loader/applicators using commercial products, additional mitigation measures such as personal protective equipment and engineering controls are required. All carbaryl products currently registered as wettable powders must be packaged in water soluble packaging.

For all other uses, to protect workers entering treated sites, revised restricted-entry intervals as well as revised application frequencies and intervals are to be added to product labels.

For the apple thinning use, revised conditions of use include minimizing the application rate, updated REIs, and label recommendations to reduce exposure, such as the use of chemical-resistant gloves during hand-thinning.

Precautionary statements to avoid drift to areas of human habitation or areas of human activity are to be added to product labels.

The Toxicological Information section on labels is to be updated to include additional information about symptoms and treatment for over-exposure.

**Environment**

- Precautionary statements include statements to reduce runoff and revised spray buffer zones for non-target aquatic habitats.
- Changes to application timing, including restriction of application during bloom for some crops, are required as a result of the pollinator risk assessment.

**What Additional Scientific Information is Being Requested?**

No data are required under section 12 of the *Pest Control Products Act*.

## Other Information

Any person may file a notice of objection[5] regarding this decision on carbaryl within 60 days from the date of publication of this Re-evaluation Decision. For more information regarding the basis for objecting (which must be based on scientific grounds), please refer to the Pesticides and Pest Management portion of Health Canada's website (Request a Reconsideration of Decision, or contact the PMRA's Pest Management Information Service.

[5] As per subsection 35(1) of the *Pest Control Products Act*.

## List of Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| ARfD | acute reference dose |
| ARI | aggregate risk index |
| ARTF | Agricultural Re-entry Task Force |
| ASAE | American Society of Agricultural Engineers |
| BChE | brain acetylcholinesterase |
| BMD | benchmark dose |
| $BMD_{10}$ | benchmark does associated with a 10% response |
| $BMDL_{10}$ | lower confidence limit on the benchmark dose associated with a 10% response |
| bw | body weight |
| ChE | acetylcholinesterase |
| cm | centimetre(s) |
| $cm^2$ | centimetres squared |
| cont'd | continued |
| %CT | percent crop treated |
| d | day(s) |
| DA | dermal absorption |
| DACO | data code |
| DFR | dislodgeable foliar residue |
| $EC_{50}$ | exposure concentration to 50% (a concentration causing 50% adverse effects in the test population |
| EChE | erythrocyte acetylcholinesterase |
| EEC | expected environmental concentration |
| EPA | Environmental Protection Agency |
| et al | and others |
| GD | gestation day |
| ha | hectare |
| kg | kilogram |
| km | kilometre(s) |
| L | litre(s) |
| $LC_{50}$ | lethal concentration to 50% (a concentration causing 50% mortality in the test population |
| LOAEL | lowest observed adverse effect level |
| M/L | mixer/loader |
| M/L/A | mixer/loader/applicator |
| mg | milligram(s) |
| mm | millimetre(s) |
| MOE | margin of exposure |
| MRL | maximum residue limit |
| NAFTA | North American Free Trade Agreement |
| NOAEL | no observed adverse effect level |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| PCA | percent cropped area |
| pH | -log10 hydrogen ion concentration |
| PMRA | Pest Management Regulatory Agency |
| PND | post-natal day |

| | |
|---|---|
| PPE | personal protective equipment |
| ppm | part per million |
| PRVD | proposed re-evaluation decision |
| PYO | pick your own facilities |
| $Q^*_1$ | lifetime cancer risk estimate |
| r.a.n. | repeat as necessary |
| REI | restricted entry interval |
| REV | Re-evaluation Note |
| SA | surface area |
| SU | Suspension |
| TC | transfer coefficient |
| TRR | total radioactive residues |
| TTR | turf transferable residues |
| USEPA | United States Environmental Protection Agency |
| UV | ultraviolet/visible spectrum |
| WBC | white blood cells |
| WP | wettable powder formulation |
| WSP | water soluble packaging |

# Appendix I Comments and Responses

## 1.0 Comments Related to the Health Risk Assessments

### 1.1 Toxicology

**Comment:**
For the dermal endpoint selected for occupational and residential risk assessment, the registrant supported the use of benchmark dose (BMD) modelling to establish the point of departure. However, the BMD values were considered too conservative based on the results from oral and dermal dosing in a pharmacokinetic (PK) study. In the PK study rats were administered a single dose of radiolabelled carbaryl and the total radioactive residues (TRR) in erythrocytes and brain were assessed. The registrant proposed that systemic levels of carbaryl associated with the oral dose of 1.08 mg/kg bw used in the PK study would not produce any significant cholinesterase inhibition, as this dose was below the $BMDL_{10}$ (lower confidence limit on the benchmark dose associated with a 10% response) values of 1.13 and 2.02 mg/kg bw for pups and adults, respectively, in an acute oral comparative cholinesterase study. Since the peak total TRR levels in brain or erythrocytes following dermal exposure of 103 mg/kg bw radiolabelled carbaryl were below the levels following an oral dose of 1.08 mg/kg bw radiolabelled carbaryl, the registrant suggested that a dermal exposure of 103 mg/kg bw carbaryl for 10 hours (the exposure duration in the PK study) would not produce significant cholinesterase inhibition.

The PMRA applied a 3-fold uncertainty factor to the dermal endpoint for the protection of infants and children. The registrant proposed reducing this to 1.8, reflecting that the $BMD_{10}$ (benchmark dose associated with a 10% response) for brain cholinesterase inhibition in PND (post-natal day) 11 pups was 1.8 fold lower than PND 97 adults in the comparative cholinesterase study. This would reduce the target margin of exposure for the dermal risk assessment of all durations from 300 to 180. The registrant considered that the single bolus dose administered in the comparative cholinesterase study likely overestimated any cholinesterase inhibition that might occur following indirect prenatal exposure. Carbaryl was also rapidly metabolized with no parent compound detected in plasma at any time point after oral dosing in the PK study, thus the registrant contended that indirect prenatal exposure was likely negligible. Consequently, an uncertainty factor of 1.8 was considered adequate by the registrant for protection of infants and children.

**PMRA Response:**
The peak total TRR by the oral route did exceed that by the dermal route in the PK study, and the oral PK dose of 1.08 mg/kg bw was lower than the oral $BMDL_{10}$s of 1.13 and 2.02 mg/kg bw for pups and adults, respectively. However, the PK study assessed TRR in erythrocytes and brain tissue, not the endpoint of concern (cholinesterase activity). The registrant's comment presumed that TRR in erythrocytes and brain tissue were related to the extent of cholinesterase inhibition, but their relationship had not been established. It is unclear how TRR in erythrocytes or brain tissue following dermal exposure related to cholinesterase activity in these compartments. This uncertainty in the relationship between TRR and cholinesterase inhibition, as well as other limitations, were discussed by the United Sates Environmental Protection Agency Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act Science Advisory Panel in 2004.

A recent paper (PMRA #1968927) investigated the relationship between carbaryl levels in brain and plasma and cholinesterase inhibition. Carbaryl levels in individual brain and plasma samples from 3 previous acute gavage studies in male rats were compared to their brain and erythrocyte cholinesterase activities at about 40 minutes post-dosing. A first order exponential decay function with an asymptote described the relationship between carbaryl levels in the brain and brain cholinesterase activity, and carbaryl levels in plasma and erythrocyte cholinesterase activity. The study authors noted that this relationship was likely valid for time periods closely approximating that used in the studies; the relevance of this information to the slower peak associated with dermal exposure is unclear. In support of the time-sensitivity of this relationship, carbaryl was not detected in the plasma of some or all rats by 2 hours post-dosing in an acute gavage time-course study (0.5 to 24 hours post-dosing; carbaryl in the brain was not assessed). A noteworthy finding from this paper was that there were no differences in the amount of carbaryl in plasma or brain between the age groups (post-natal days 11, 21 and 97). In other words, carbaryl levels in the brain or plasma are not equivalent to cholinesterase inhibition, given that PND 11 pups were more sensitive than adults to ChE inhibition. The higher sensitivity of the young to carbaryl cannot be explained by higher levels of brain carbaryl.

The registrant suggested that the 103 mg/kg bw used in the acute dermal component of the PK study must be a NOAEL (no observed adverse effect level) for short-term dermal exposure. This was based on lower TRR in brain and erythrocytes from this dermal dose, relative to those measured from an oral dose comparable to that of the $BMDL_{10}$s for BChE (brain acetylcholinesterase) and EChE (erythrocyte acetylcholinesterase ) inhibition[6] from an acute oral dose of carbaryl. This assumed that total TRR are equivalent to the amount of carbaryl, and that the total TRRs in Figures 1 and 2 of registrant's comments from the other radiolabelled metabolites (1-naphthol and *N*-hydroxymethyl carbaryl) in the PK study did not contribute significantly to the extent of cholinesterase inhibition. Given that age-related differences in PK were not observed in the recent literature study, reliance on the PK information to refine the dermal toxicity endpoint is not supported.

In addition, while the oral component of the PK study was considered acceptable, there was uncertainty regarding the data from the dermal route due to concerns with study methodology. The dermal dose was applied in an acetone/water solution on a waterproof band-aid, exposed to air to evaporate the acetone prior to exposure to skin. There was uncertainty whether residual acetone/water remained on the band-aid, which may have affected the absorption. A greater uncertainty was the amount available for absorption, since residual carbaryl left on the removed bandaid and on the skin was not measured after study termination. In addition, the band-aid upon which the dose was applied was 1 inch by 2 inches (equivalent to 12.9 $cm^2$, or approximately 3% of the total body surface area[7]). The dermal exposure may have been underestimated due to the small surface area (while this is not a repeated dose dermal toxicity study, OECD guideline 410 recommends 10% of the body surface area be covered.) As such, the toxicity of carbaryl by the dermal route could be underestimated.

---

6 The PMRA determines the $BMDL_{20}$ (not a $BMDL_{10}$) for EChE inhibition.

7 From the study, the male Sprague-Dawley rat was on average 277 g or 242 g, for the low or high dose dermal exposures, respectively. For a 200-299 g rat, the total body surface is about 394 $cm^2$. (PMRA document number 2309078)

The 4-week dermal toxicity study in rats demonstrated that a dermal dose of 103 mg/kg bw exceeded a NOAEL (PMRA document number 1526156). There was BChE inhibition in both sexes (15% in males, 24% in females with statistical significance), as well as transient EChE inhibition in males on days 5 - 19 (15 to 21% inhibition with statistical significance), and decreased body weight gain in males (12%) at the highest dose of 100 mg/kg bw/day. There was also decreased BChE activity (15% with statistical significance) in males at the LOAEL of 50 mg/kg bw/day, with a resultant NOAEL of 20 mg/kg bw/day. Thus this study provided empirical evidence that the NOAEL for short-term dermal exposure should not be 103 mg/kg bw/day. The $BMDL_{10}$ of 35.5 mg/kg bw/day was selected as a point of departure, rather than the NOAEL of 20 mg/kg bw/day. The higher sensitivity to carbaryl by the oral route than the dermal route was reflected in the higher dermal $BMDL_{10}$ of 35.5 mg/kg bw/day, relative to the oral $BMDL_{10}$ of 1-2 mg/kg bw.

The registrant suggested refinement of the 3-fold uncertainty factor for the protection of infants and children in the target Margin of Exposure for dermal risk assessment. Based on the acute oral comparative cholinesterase study, the $BMD_{10}$ ratio of brain cholinesterase inhibition for adults (2.55 mg/kg bw) versus PND11 pups (1.48 mg/kg bw) was 1.72, clearly identifying that the directly exposed young were more sensitive to carbaryl. Refinement of the uncertainty factor was not undertaken, because there was limited confidence in the robustness of this $BMD_{10}$ ratio as being representative of the sensitivity of all young populations. There was uncertainty that BMD modelling was sufficiently robust to refine a risk assessment for this purpose, because even with the same data, BMD values can differ based on the model selected and the parameters selected within a model. There was also uncertainty as to how this ratio might change if brain cholinesterase activity was sampled at other times after dosing. In the comparative cholinesterase study in rats, cholinesterase activity was assessed at 40 minutes after dosing, based on stated time-to-peak effects in PND 17 and adult rats, with no time-to-peak information presented for PND 11 pups. It was also unknown how the $BMD_{10}$ ratio would be altered if other age groups were tested. Furthermore, the $BMD_{10}$ ratio was from an oral study and it was unknown whether this ratio would be reflective of differences in sensitivity by the dermal route. Thus there was insufficient confidence that reducing the margin of exposure (MOE) based on the $BMD_{10}$ ratio was protective of potential sensitivity in a young population.

The PMRA agreed that administration via a bolus dose may overestimate the exposure level expected in a fetus or neonate, but the extent of overestimation is unclear. The PMRA also agreed that the metabolism of carbaryl after an oral dose was rapid in the PK study, with relatively slower metabolism by the dermal route. Carbaryl in the brain was not tested by the dermal route in the PK study, but it would be expected to also reach the brain at a different rate than the oral route. However, rapid metabolism by the oral route may not necessarily equate to negligible exposure to the fetus or neonate. While the parent compound was not detected in plasma in the PK study by either the single oral or dermal exposure, carbaryl was observed in plasma and brain tissue in acute toxicity studies in male rats with higher single oral doses of carbaryl. Thus fetal brains could be indirectly exposed to carbaryl above negligible levels by the dermal or oral route. The pharmacokinetics of carbaryl in the fetal brain and consequent pharmacodynamic effects of cholinesterase inhibition in fetuses remained unclear. Therefore it

was considered appropriate to use a 3-fold uncertainty factor to protect infants and children in the dermal risk assessment.

### 1.1.1 Refinement of the 3-fold Uncertainty Factor to 1.8-fold

**Comment:**
The registrant suggested refinement of the 3-fold uncertainty factor for database deficiency, applied to the dermal toxicity endpoint to address potential sensitivity of the young via the dermal route. The registrant considered that a 1.8-fold uncertainty factor would be more appropriate to address post-natal sensitivity to carbaryl, based on the relative $BMD_{10}$ for brain cholinesterase inhibition in adults relative to postnatal (PND) 11 pups in an acute oral comparative cholinesterase study.

**PMRA Response:**
Refinement of the 3-fold uncertainty factor was not undertaken, because there was limited confidence in this $BMD_{10}$ ratio as being representative of the sensitivity of all young populations. There was uncertainty that BMD modelling was sufficiently robust to refine a risk assessment for this purpose, because even with the same data, BMD values can differ based on the model selected and the parameters selected within a model. There was also uncertainty as to how this ratio might change if brain cholinesterase activity was sampled at other times after dosing. In the comparative cholinesterase study in rats, cholinesterase activity was assessed at 40 minutes after dosing, based on stated time-to-peak effects in PND 17 and adult rats, with no time-to-peak information presented for PND 11 pups. It was also unknown how the $BMD_{10}$ ratio would be altered if other age groups were tested. Furthermore as the dermal toxicity study was conducted solely in adults, but the $BMD_{10}$ ratio was from an oral study, it was unknown whether this ratio would be reflective of sensitivity by the dermal route. Given these uncertainties, it was considered appropriate to use a 3-fold uncertainty factor to protect for potential sensitivity of fetuses and nursing infants in the dermal risk assessment.

### 1.1.2 Intraspecies Differences in Neurodevelopment

**Comment:**
The registrant proposed refinement of the 3-fold uncertainty factor applied to the dermal post-occupational risk assessment, based on the differences in neurodevelopment between the neonatal rat up to PND 21and the human infant.

**PMRA Response:**
The human and rat neurodevelopmental timelines provided by the registrant, based on comparative brain morphology, suggested that early brain development took longer to develop in rats, relative to humans. However, the sensitivity of PND 11 rats relative to adults demonstrated in a comparative cholinesterase assay was still considered relevant to humans and should be taken into account in the risk assessment. If not considered a manifestation of post-natal sensitivity due to differences in neurodevelopment, the effect would be considered as evidence of potential pre-natal (for example, perinatal) sensitivity, rather than no sensitivity at all.

### 1.1.3 No Fetal Sensitivity to Brain Cholinesterase Effects in Sufficient and Available Studies

**Comment:**
The registrant considered that there was sufficient information available to address outstanding concerns regarding exposure to the fetus and no additional data was required to address these concerns.

**PMRA Response:**
It was agreed that overall the carbaryl reproduction, developmental and developmental neurotoxicity studies did not indicate fetal sensitivity. There was a limited developmental study in the mouse wherein offspring had increased resorptions and variations in the absence of maternal toxicity, as well as malformations at maternally toxic levels, but these effects were not replicated in another dietary and gavage mouse prenatal developmental toxicity study. However, with the exception of one rabbit developmental toxicity study (which showed that maternal cholinesterase inhibition occurred at lower levels than the fetal effects observed), and one limited rat developmental neurotoxicity study (the NIEHS/NTP study discussed below), none of the reproduction, developmental or developmental neurotoxicity studies included cholinesterase measurements. No sensitivity of the prenatal young was observed in the NIEHS/NTP developmental neurotoxicity study, but it was hampered by lack of detail (including unknown levels of cholinesterase inhibition, unknown number of pups examined). As such, the potential for prenatal and lactational sensitivity of the young was not adequately addressed in the database.

The registrant submitted 4 published and 1 unpublished references that pertained to prenatal exposure to carbaryl. The unpublished NIEHS/NTP study was not available in its completed study form, but the synopsis of this study in USEPA HIARC reports for carbaryl (PMRA document numbers 1572726 and 2308493) indicated that brain cholinesterase (BChE) inhibition was similar in dams and fetuses on gestation day (GD) 19, after repeated oral exposure to dams from gestation days 14 to 18. This was previously taken under consideration in the PMRA re-evaluation of carbaryl, for although it suggested that prenatal sensitivity was not of concern, there were insufficient animals (one dam and two fetuses per time point) and lack of study details (including extent of change, study methodology of how and when animals were tested for BChE inhibition) to decisively exclude the concern for prenatal sensitivity of the young. Three published studies also demonstrated that oral exposure to dams on GD18, or after repeated daily oral exposure from GD11 to GD23, did not increase BChE inhibition in fetal rats, in comparison to pregnant dams (PMRA document numbers 2308483, 2308491 and 2308485). Together, these studies indicated that prenatal exposure was possible through placental transfer. They suggested that sensitivity was not of concern, but the data quality of these studies was such that there was limited confidence in their conclusions. The particular concerns are the lack of detail (including unknown number of dams and/or fetuses examined, time after dosing and pup delivery that BChE activity was assessed in dams, or time after dosing that fetal brains were extracted for BChE activity).

An autoradiographic study in pregnant Sprague-Dawley rats and Swiss mice also demonstrated that placental transfer was possible in rodents (PMRA document number 2308487). The radioactivity from an oral dose of 10 mg/kg bw radiolabelled carbaryl was distributed to the brain (and other organs) much faster in fetal rats (detected by 0.5 hours post-dosing) than in mice (not detected at 0.5 or 1 hour post-dosing, but detected at 5 hours post-dosing). This study did not elucidate whether fetuses were more or less sensitive, as dams were not similarly autoradiographed.

If further information is submitted for these studies to enhance their robustness, or if a new study to address prenatal exposure is submitted, it may be possible to reconsider the sensitivity of the prenatal young. However, the sensitivity of the post-natal young via lactational transfer was still unclear. There were no studies available examining the effect of carbaryl on BChE or erythrocyte (EChE) inhibition in nursing pups. Without further data, postnatal sensitivity via lactational transfer cannot be excluded. With the given database, the current 3-fold uncertainty factor for database deficiency applied to the dermal risk assessment was considered to be appropriate.

The registrant also submitted references to 4 published studies pertaining to post-natal sensitivity of directly-dosed young. These studies investigated EChE and BChE inhibition after acute or repeated oral doses of carbaryl in young and/or adult rats, and/or the mechanism in post-natal sensitivity. Two of these references pertained to the acute comparative cholinesterase study which provided evidence of post-natal sensitivity of the young to ChE inhibition (PMRA document numbers 1533160 and 2308498); this study data was used in the carbaryl re-evaluation.

Another study determined the carbaryl levels in the brain and plasma of the rats in the acute comparative cholinesterase study, as well as three other acute and repeated dose cholinesterase studies, and related them to the extent of ChE inhibition in these tissues (PMRA #2308494). The post-natal sensitivity of the young to BChE and EChE inhibition in these studies were not due to differences in carbaryl levels in the brain, as levels were comparable irrespective of age. The mechanism behind post-natal sensitivity to carbaryl was further investigated in an *in vitro* pharmacokinetic study that determined pharmacokinetic parameters (AChE IC50, Km, Vmax) of brain cholinesterase in mixtures of carbaryl and whole brain homogenates of rats ranging in age from PND 4 to 90 (PMRA document number 2309077). The post-natal sensitivity of the young was not attributed to intrinsic developmental differences in BChE sensitivity, based on similar Km, and relatively lower Vmax and higher IC50 in the young. While informative, the data from these studies do not elucidate the mechanism behind the post-natal sensitivity of the young to ChE inhibition, nor do they affect the reference doses selected for the risk assessment of carbaryl.

### 1.2 Comments Related to Residential and Occupational Exposure

Comments recommended that the occupational and residential mixer/loader/applicator and postapplication risk assessments be revised based on: updated use information, updated crop groupings, revised application rates, revised postapplication activities, updated transfer

coefficients, revised application intervals and frequencies, and revised dermal absorption estimates.

The PMRA has revised the occupational mixer/loader/applicator risk assessment in accordance with comments received to the greatest extent possible. The mixer/loader/applicator risk assessments for canola, tobacco and orchard crops were revised based on updated application rates and use information; the results of the revised risk assessment are presented in Appendix II. The mixer/loader/applicator risk assessments for all other uses are as described in PRVD2009-14, as there were no further updates to the information used in these risk assessments.

Due to the risks of concern for certain uses, personal protective equipment and engineering controls are required to mitigate risk. The personal protection equipment required for each crop use is intended to protect against the greatest potential exposure.

The postapplication risk assessments for a number of crops were revised based on: updated use information, updated crop groupings, revised application rates, revised postapplication activities, updated transfer coefficients, and revised application intervals and frequencies. The results of the revised risk assessments are presented in AppendixIV. The postapplication risk assessments for all other uses are as described in PRVD2009-14. The postapplication risk assessment for turf was revised based on updated use information. The results of the revised risk assessment are presented in AppendixIV.

Specific comments are addressed below.

### 1.2.1 Comments relating to the Human Health Risk Assessment for Agricultural Uses

**Comment:**
Stakeholders requested that updated transfer coefficients (TCs) based on the Agricultural Re-entry Task Force (ARTF) data be used in the risk assessments, rather than the TCs in USEPA Policy 3.1.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA has analyzed the detailed comments for transfer coefficients (TCs) that could be amended and incorporated these refinements into an updated risk assessment. Where applicable, the PMRA has reviewed the ARTF database and proposed clustering schemes, determined the most appropriate TC, and conducted new postapplication risk assessments. The refinement of the TCs resulted in reduced restricted-entry intervals (REIs) for some crops, but increased REIs for other crops. Refer to Appendix IVfor the results of the revised risk assessment.

**Comment:**
Multiple stakeholders have proposed use pattern refinements based on revisions to label language, such as dividing crop groupings, limiting particular times of application, or clarification of spray rates.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA has examined the specific comments to identify any refinements that are deemed both agronomically feasible and suitable for label amendments. In the interest of providing clear and consistent end-use product labels, it was not possible to divide crop groupings or specify application timings for certain uses. However, efforts were made to ensure that all the applicable recommended refinements were taken into account. Spray rate clarifications provided by stakeholders during the PRVD2009-10 consultation were confirmed and applied as necessary.

Changes made to the use pattern (such as revised spray rates or the separation of crop groupings) are presented in detail in Appendix II and AppendixIV, where the revised risk assessments for mixer/loader/applicators and postapplication workers are provided.

**Comment:**
Stakeholders have proposed several clarifications or new restrictions regarding the number of applications permitted per year or crop cycle.

**PMRA Response:**
Bayer CropScience indicated that the maximum number of applications for all registered commercial commodities was three per year (with the exception of chokecherry shulterbelts at once per year), with a 7-10 day interval unless otherwise stated (Bayer, 2007b). However, due to the limited number of dislodgeable foliar residue (DFR) studies available, it was necessary to assess some crops according to the number of applications and application intervals described in the DFR studies. Appendix V lists the number of applications and application intervals per crop.

**Comment:**
Registrants requested refinement of the dermal toxicity endpoint based on consideration of oral and dermal pharmacokinetic data, as well as a refinement of the dermal absorption value based upon the carbaryl *in vitro* human and rat dermal absorption study. Specifically, the registrants proposed that based on a comparison of the rat and human dermal absorption in the *in vitro* dermal absorption study (Dick, 2001), rat skin is approximately 2.8 times more permeable than human skin at low concentrations. The dermal absorption between the rat *in vivo* study (Chung, 1995) and the rat *in vitro* (Dick, 2001) was also compared. The registrants concluded that the overall consistency between the *in vivo* and *in vitro* dermal penetration studies for carbaryl supports adjustment of the BMD value from the 28-day dermal study by a factor of 2.8, to account for the difference in permeability between rat and human skin. This was considered by the registrants to be supported by the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) dermal absorption policy on the use of *in vitro* dermal penetration data in risk assessment, noting that a critical point in the NAFTA policy for the use of *in vitro* data is the demonstrated consistency between *in vitro* and *in vivo* data.

**PMRA Response:**
Since the occupational and residential risk assessment was based on a dermal toxicity study in rats, a dermal absorption value for carbaryl was not required. In the comment above, the registrant is proposing adjusting the dermal toxicological point of departure, or bench mark dose, based on differences between rats and humans.

Adjustment of the bench mark dose (BMD) values by a factor of 2.6 to account for the difference in permeability between rat and human skin is not supported by the PMRA. An adjustment of the BMD could also be considered an adjustment for the interspecies uncertainty factor, specifically the toxicokinetic factor. For such an adjustment to be made, a large amount of data conducted under similar conditions is required to refine the toxicokinetic factor, which accounts for the absorption, transport, metabolism and transformation, sequestration and excretion of the chemical. The PMRA does not agree that the results from one *in vitro* study done, which was not conducted under similar conditions as the dermal toxicology study, would be sufficient to refine the default uncertainty factor for toxicokinetics.

The SAFE'A Dermal Absorption Group position paper on the *Use of In Vitro Dermal Absorption Data in Risk Assessment* outlines that when the *in vitro* animal technique is shown to be a good predictor of animal *in vivo* data (in other words, a ratio close to 1), the human *in vitro* data are likely to be a good predictor of human dermal absorption when conducted under the same conditions. This is also referred to as the 'triple pack approach.' This paper also discusses a number of 'minimal standards' which should be considered when applying the triple pack approach. These include: same dose/duration regimen, guideline studies (i.e., no major limitations), reproducibility of *in vitro* results, and consideration of regional variability in human skin.

Consideration of the triple pack approach to adjust dermal toxicological points of departure was not the mandate of the SAFE'A Dermal Absorption Working Group. The intent of the position paper and the triple pack approach was to provide guidance on determining dermal absorption for exposure assessments when the toxicology reference dose is based on an oral study.

The PMRA did, however, review the dermal absorption data available for carbaryl, as this was required for the cancer risk assessment, as well as any assessments based on toxicological points of departure from non-dermal studies.

The dermal absorption values cited by the registrant in their comments do not include skin bound residues. Since the studies were terminated at 24 hours, characterization of the fate of the skin bound residues is not possible and, thus, skin bound residues were included in the PMRA estimate of dermal absorption, as per the USEPA Health Effects Test Guidelines USEPA, 1998.

The *in vitro* and *in vivo* studies cited by the registrant were previously reviewed and did not meet the criteria as per the SAFE'A position paper. As shown in Table 1.2.1, the studies do not result in a ratio close to 1 when dermal absorption values are compared, nor did they meet the minimal standards outlined in the position paper, as the doses (medium, high) and exposure durations differ between the two studies. In addition, the formulations in the two studies are not the same; formulants have been shown to affect dermal penetration (Bronaugh and Franz, 1986).

**Table 1.2.1 Comparison of Dermal Absorption (DA) Values for In Vivo and In Vitro Studies**

| Rat *In Vivo* DA (Cheng, 1995) | | | Rat *In Vitro* DA (Dick, 2001) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dose ($\mu g/cm^2$) | DA w/SBR | | Dose ($\mu g/cm^2$) (actual dose) | DA w/SBR (8 h) |
| | 10 h | 24 h | | |
| 35.6 | 21.1% | 34.0% | 36 | 28.1% |
| 403 | 10.8% | 27.9% | 470 | 37.8% |
| 3450 | 2.5% | 4.0% | 4495 | 5.9% |

w/SBR = with skin bound residues; actual dose = actual amount applied (versus nominal dose)

**Comment:**
The postapplication risk assessment for trees and shrubs should have applied the initial Dislodgable Foliar Residue (DFR) of 3.4% of the application rate on olives from the available DFR data.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA did review the ARTF olive study and did consider it for use in the assessment of ornamentals (trees, shrubs) and fruit trees, since the application equipment, formulation and tree canopy would be similar. The initial DFR of 3.4% of the application rate was not used in the assessment, as it was much lower than what was seen for other crops, potentially due to the morphology of olive trees, differences in foliage type, or the spacing in the olive grove. Therefore, the default DFR value of 20% of the initial application rate was used. The 9.8% daily dissipation as measured in the study was used for the risk assessment. As noted in the comments, this value is similar to the default dissipation of 10% per day.

**Comment:**
The registrant indicated that the six tree crops grouped together need to be separated based on existing label directions, since these six crops have different application rates, preharvest intervals, and spray schedules that can affect the DFRs.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA has examined the label directions to ensure that those crops that have different application rates are evaluated separately. Spray schedules on the label and preharvest intervals have no impact on the DFR values calculated; the determined DFR values are based on the parameters of the DFR studies used, which in turn are imposed on the affected use pattern. For those uses where default values were used instead of study values, the PMRA did take into consideration label directions concerning application frequencies and intervals. Pre-harvest intervals were only taken into consideration for those use scenarios where the PHI precluded certain postapplication intervals.

**Comment:**
The registrant believes that hand line irrigation should not be considered for tree crops because carbaryl is a foliar spray and irrigation lines do not run through the foliage; irrigation would either be overhead or drip, and any hand labour activities would not involve foliar contact. Therefore, an REI would not be relevant to irrigation.

**PMRA Response:**
As indicated by the registrant, overhead and drip irrigation systems are commonly used in newer orchards. However, since hand line irrigation is common in older orchards and still in use for certain tree varieties, there is still a need to address the exposure incurred during hand line irrigation. Although an airblast application is directed at the foliage of fruit trees, it is assumed that some spray residue would come into contact with a hand-line irrigation system. In addition, some foliar contact may occur during hand-line irrigation depending on the variety and developmental stage of the trees. The amount of foliar contact incurred in fruit tree orchards while using hand line irrigation is difficult to determine, due to the variety of orchard production systems, the tree spacing for each crop, the variety of irrigation systems used, and a lack of information on the extent of use of various irrigation systems within orchards. Since it has been determined that foliar contact may occur during the use of hand line irrigation in some orchard crops, an REI for hand line irrigation in tree crops is indeed required to address any risks of concern (See Appendix IV for details).

**Comment:**
The 8 hour workday assumed in the postapplication risk assessment should be refined to reflect field conditions and specific tasks.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA does not have sufficient information to reduce the number of hours for specific postapplication activities. The information available to the PMRA indicates that 8 hours is an appropriate estimate of work day duration for agricultural workers. This value may in fact underestimate actual work day duration, as discussed below; however, it is considered to be a suitable estimate for use in regulatory risk assessments. The question of workday duration was addressed by a USEPA Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act Science Advisory Panel, which endorsed the use of 8 hours (2008).

The 8 hour duration is based on a grower survey (Thompson, 1998) and a United States Department of Labor report (USDL, 2005) from the National Agricultural Worker Survey. These were considered to be the best available data. The Science Advisory Panel concurred with the USEPA's scientific analysis that these datasets were adequate to establish a workday duration of 8 hour for generic dermal exposure assessment.

Further, the Panel agreed that the use of the 8 hour workday duration represents a large proportion of the exposure distribution profile, but does not adequately reflect exposures at the 90$^{th}$ or 95$^{th}$ percentiles of the distribution following a single day exposure. The data presented by the USEPA suggested that the use of the central tendency of 8 hours for workday duration resulted in an estimated dermal exposure that fell at the 65$^{th}$ percentile, underestimating exposure for 35% of the population. The Panel stated that the USEPA's estimates fell short of being "high end" estimates of exposure.

**Comment**
Consider reducing REIs based on a 90% exposure reduction for the use of chemical resistant gloves.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA acknowledges that gloves are often worn during postapplication activities for some crops. Gloves are typically worn as protection (for example, thorns) or to prevent the transmission of microorganisms from the worker to the plant commodity. However, the type of glove worn may not be chemical resistant, and the level of chemical protection afforded by the gloves worn by postapplication workers is unknown. While the use of chemical resistant gloves and other exposure reduction practices are recommended, the consideration of PPE as mitigation for postapplication workers in the risk assessment is not appropriate for regulatory purposes. Moreover, gloves are usually not worn in hot weather, and delicate tasks such as hand thinning often cannot be adequately performed while wearing gloves.

**Comment:**
Different carbaryl formulations have different maximum application rates and the REIs should be set based on the application rates for each formulation.

**PMRA Response:**
In the interest of clarity and consistency, one REI is recommended based on the formulation associated with the greatest worker exposure. This approach ensures that the risks of concern are addressed for all workers, regardless of the formulation used. In addition, it prevents REI disparity among labels for the same use.

### 1.2.2 Comments Relating to the Human Health Risk Assessment for Turf Use

**Comment:**
Stakeholders have suggested that the risk assessment should be refined in terms of workday duration (golf courses) and reduced transfer coefficients (all turf).

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA agrees that the duration of 4 hours could be applicable to the postapplication risk assessment for golf course turf (greens and tees only) treated with carbaryl, based on the information submitted by the registrant. The postapplication risk assessment for golf course workers could be refined to reflect this by decreasing the anticipated hours worked per day from 8 to 4. However, a duration of 4 hours is applicable to greens and tees only, and does not adequately address postapplication exposure on the entire golf course. Given that some of the

pest pressures related to carbaryl use require broadcast applications to turf, a label statement would be required limiting the use of carbaryl to greens and tees. In the absence of this label statement, the duration of 8 hours must be retained (see Table IV.3 of Appendix IV).

The transfer coefficient (TC) supplied in the comments from the registrant (758 $cm^2$/hr) is not used by the PMRA. The ARTF golf course worker study (ARTF 057) was closely reviewed by the PMRA and the Standard Operating Procedure for turf was revised based on this ARTF study. The TC of 3500 $cm^2$/hr was considered appropriate for use in the risk assessment to calculate golf course worker exposure, since this is the arithmetic mean of all replicates for all activities. This value represents a composite TC of all activities a worker may be performing throughout the day.

The registrant suggested revising the TC for golf course workers performing mowing, watering, cup changing, repairing irrigation, and miscellaneous grooming activities from 3500 $cm^2$/hr to 758 $cm^2$/hr. The registrant has also previously expressed concern over the large difference between the geometric mean and the arithmetic mean of the data set and suggested that one replicate (IR8) with an unusually high TC for the lower leg should be excluded as an outlier. The validity of this request was considered.

The high TC (75,910 $cm^2$/hr) comes from a worker performing irrigation repair. These workers are likely to get wet and to kneel on the ground, leading to increased residue transfer, so one of these workers having a higher exposure on their lower legs is not necessarily unusual.

The total dermal exposure for this worker (IR8) is 1594 µg/kg. The next highest exposure value for irrigation workers is 1402 µg/kg. The total dermal exposure for all replicates in the data set ranges from 40.9 µg/kg to 3222 µg/kg. This implies that exposure for this worker was not exceptionally high. The Transferable Turf Residue (TTR) value for this worker (IR8) is 0.021 µg/$cm^2$, which is low. The high TC is a result of a relatively high exposure values combined with a low TTR value. However, some of the other replicates had TTR values lower than this one (TTR values ranged from 0.014 to 2.8 µg/$cm^2$ with an arithmetic mean of 0.62 µg/$cm^2$).

As such, PMRA does not accept the rationale to exclude either the high exposure from one monitoring unit, or the low exposure from another. For this reason, the PMRA does not agree that the IR8 replicate should be excluded as an outlier, and maintains that the TC of 3500 $cm^2$/hr is appropriate for use in the risk assessment for golf course workers performing mowing, watering, cup changing, repairing irrigation, and miscellaneous grooming activities.

The arithmetic mean of the TC was used, since the TC is a composite TC representing many activities that would occur during the course of a day. Therefore, the average value of all these activities is most appropriate. In addition, as the arithmetic mean of the TTR values were used, it was considered appropriate to couple these values with the arithmetic mean of the TC.

When using the TC of 3500 $cm^2$/hr for all golf course activities, the calculated restricted-entry intervals are considered to be agronomically unfeasible for certain postapplication activities (See Table IV.3 of Appendix IV). Although a number of comments received from stakeholders highlight the importance of the use of carbaryl on turf, the risks of concern identified for both mixer/loader/applicators and postapplication workers cannot be further mitigated.

To separate turf activities and assign different TCs for each activity reduces confidence in each TC, as the number of replicates is low for each individual activity and there is high variability in the exposure estimates. In addition, a worker would do many tasks throughout the day. Having separate REIs for each activity is not practical. Therefore, the composite TC of 3500 $cm^2$/hr was considered appropriate to represent the various tasks a worker would do throughout the day. The resulting exposure estimates, MOEs and REIs are presented in Table IV.3 of Appendix IV. The golf course and sod farm REIs are considered to be agronomically unfeasible, based on the revised and refined risk assessment. These uses will be cancelled as a result of the worker and postapplication risks of concern.

**Comment:**
Consider adding spot and border treatments as a label statement for residential turf uses.

**PMRA Response:**
The spot application use directions, as suggested by the registrant, are appropriate for ants and possibly cutworms and fall armyworm. However, to effectively control European chafer, Japanese beetle, leatherjackets, chinch bugs and sod webworms, the entire lawn would typically need to be treated, since the damage from these pests is not concentrated into one small area as it is for ants. Therefore, spot and border treatments for residential turf are not considered to be appropriate methods to mitigate residential exposure.

### 1.2.3 Comments Relating to the Human Health Risk Assessment for Apple Thinning

**Comment:**
The registrant has proposed a number of significant label changes with regards to the carbaryl apple thinning use. The registrant believes the resulting label will provide growers clearer "directions for use" that will result in flexibility for apple growers to select application rates, PPE and agronomically feasible REIs.

**PMRA Response:**
The postapplication risk assessment for all apple activities has been updated in accordance with the revised use pattern (See Tables IV.1 and IV.2 of Appendix IV). The risk assessment was revised and refined based on updated use information, revised application rates and other information provided by registrants and stakeholders. Notwithstanding the high level of refinement, risks of concern to workers involved with hand thinning following the use of carbaryl as a chemical thinning agent remain. As a result, revised conditions of use have been developed to minimize the risk to workers:

For orchards that have transitioned to high density trellis production architecture (for example, spindle or super spindle trees):

- Maximum seasonal rate of 1.5 kg a.i./ha and an REI of 14 days for hand thinning

For orchards that have not transitioned to high density trellis production architecture (for example, dwarf, semi-dwarf and full sized trees):

- Maximum seasonal rate of 1.0 kg a.i./ha and an REI of 17 days for hand thinning

The use of chemical-resistant gloves may further reduce potential exposure. The updated postapplication risk assessment is based on the unmodified orchard thinning transfer coefficient of 3000 $cm^2$/hr and a $BMDL_{10}$ of 35.5 mg/kg bw/day. The TC used likely over-estimates dermal postapplication exposure for high-density trellis orchards. However, the degree of over-estimation cannot be quantified.

### 1.3 Comments Relating to the Dietary Risk Assessment

The acute aggregate dietary (in other words, food plus water) assessment was updated to reflect the revised use pattern. Previously, the drinking water assessment was based on carbaryl application to turf. However, since the use of carbaryl on residential turf, golf courses and sod farms is to be cancelled due to residential and occupational risk concerns, the drinking water modelling is now based on carbaryl application to field crops (two applications of 3.0 kg a.i./ha) assuming an 8-day interval between applications. The full distribution of drinking water estimated environmental concentrations (EECs) was incorporated into the residue file. As a result, the acute aggregate dietary exposure for carbaryl is 41% of the acute reference dose for the general population, and ranges from 31 to 107% for the various population subgroups (see Table 1.3 below). The highest exposure at 107% occurs for all infants and is not of concern due to use of certain conservative (that is, high-end) assumptions in the exposure assessment, attributable primarily to the use of water modelling data to estimate drinking water exposures.

**Table 1.3 Acute Aggregate Dietary Exposure and Risk**

| Sub-population | Acute Aggregate Dietary (food and drinking water) Exposure (99.9th percentile exposure) | |
|---|---|---|
| | Exposure (mg/kg bw/day) | % ARfD [a] |
| General population | 0.004497 | 41 |
| All infants | 0.011788 | 107 |
| Children 1-2 years | 0.007795 | 71 |
| Children 3-5 years | 0.006580 | 60 |
| Children 6-12 years | 0.004651 | 42 |
| Youth 13-19 years | 0.003371 | 31 |
| Adults 20-49 years | 0.004236 | 39 |
| Adults 50+ years | 0.003685 | 33 |
| Females 13-49 years | 0.004424 | 40 |

[a] ARfD (Acute Reference Dose) = 0.011 mg/kg bw ($BMDL_{10}$ = 1.13 mg/kg bw and Composite Adjustment Factor of 100)

**Comment:**
While monitoring data may be considered as a lower bound of the peak environmental concentration, monitoring data of surface water bodies are not necessarily representative of drinking water concentrations. Monitoring data from drinking water sources in Canada as presented in Table 2 in Appendix XVII (of the PRVD2009-14) show a peak concentration of 0.005 ppb. In the drinking water monitoring study conducted by Bayer CropScience, for high use locations in the United States, the peak concentration was 0.16 ppb, which would be a reasonable upper bound on a peak carbaryl concentration in drinking water in the United States.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA considers monitoring data from surface waters in its drinking water assessments because some Canadians do not obtain their drinking water from treatment facilities. The PMRA has considered and included the monitoring study provided by the registrant into its drinking water assessment, and notes that the maximum concentrations detected were 0.181 µg/L. The PMRA considers monitoring data from the United States, given the extensive monitoring programs that exist in the United States. The PMRA notes that monitoring data from the United States Geological Survey's National Water Quality Assessment Program indicate that concentrations of carbaryl in surface water were as high as 33.5 µg/L in agricultural land use areas, 45.2 µg/L in mixed land use areas, 5.5 µg/L in urban land use areas, and 16.5 µg/L in other land use areas. These data were also considered in the PMRA's drinking water assessment. A revised peak concentration in drinking water was calculated as 10.6 µg/L.

Although carbaryl monitoring data were considered sufficient for the chronic and cancer dietary risk assessments, in general these data are not considered appropriate for an acute dietary risk assessment. The PMRA notes that water monitoring, as is the case in most available studies for carbaryl, generally involves sampling that is limited in time and space, and thus is unlikely to capture peak concentrations that can occur immediately after use. Since turf uses are to be cancelled, the drinking water assessment was based on other agricultural uses of carbaryl. Based on this drinking water scenario, there are no acute aggregate dietary risks of concern in the updated assessment.

**Comment:**
Bayer CropScience concurs that use of percent crop area (PCA) would be appropriate for refining modeled drinking water EECs, but believe drinking water monitoring data provide the most realistic estimates of drinking water concentrations for carbaryl. We are, however, proposing to work with PMRA on development of PCA data because of its widespread applicability.

**PMRA Response:**
Carbaryl is fairly mobile and is unlikely to persist and accumulate in the environment. Water monitoring, as noted previously is unlikely to capture peak concentrations that can occur. This rationale is consistent with the approach taken by the USEPA for carbaryl. The USEPA determined that currently available monitoring studies for carbaryl were limited in the likeliness to capture peak concentrations in the environment, and did not use them to define peak values for carbaryl. As noted above, carbaryl monitoring data were considered sufficient for the chronic and cancer dietary risk assessments, but were not considered appropriate for an acute dietary risk assessment.

PMRA currently uses, on a case-by-case basis, PCAs based on Census of Agriculture data at the consolidated census subdivision level. PCAs based on watersheds which feed drinking water systems might be an improvement on this approach and is being investigated.

Preliminary scoping of the percent crop areas (PCAs) for various crops indicates that the PCAs for carbaryl are relatively large and may not necessarily refine the aggregate acute dietary risk assessment. Since turf uses are to be cancelled, the drinking water assessment was based on other agricultural uses of carbaryl. Based on this drinking water scenario, there are no dietary acute risks of concern in the updated assessment.

## 2.0 Comments Related to the Environmental Risk Assessments

### 2.1 Effects on Aquatic Organisms

**Comment:**
The registrant indicated that the use of a single data point from the most sensitive species is inappropriate and overly conservative for a number of reasons. Additional data on aquatic invertebrates were submitted for consideration to develop a species sensitivity distribution. By considering these data and the two mesocosm studies, the registrant has proposed that 10 µg/L in buffer zone calculations would provide adequate protection for aquatic invertebrates. Although the database for estuarine/marine invertebrates is smaller, the sensitivity of marine/estuarine species is in the same range as freshwater species, and this value of 10µg/L would also be appropriate for marine/estuarine species.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA has reviewed the additional studies submitted by the registrant and the results are as follows:

The mesocosm study by Helm (1993)[8] was conducted at pH 9-10. Carbaryl rapidly hydrolyzes at pH>7 (half-life at pH 8 and 9 is 4 and <1 d, respectively). Given the pH of many aquatic ecosystems is < 9, it was determined that this study is not relevant to environmental conditions.

[8] Helm 1993, Carbaryl (Sevin (R) XLR Plus): Outdoor aquatic microcosm test for environmental fate and ecological effects.

The other mesocosm study (Havens, 1995) confirms that *Daphnia* is more sensitive than smaller cladocerans to the carbamate carbaryl and that cladocerans in general are more sensitive than copepods. It also indicates that the zooplankton at the concentration of 10µg/L of carbaryl is reduced by 50%.

The registrant submitted eight toxicity studies on aquatic invertebrates and two of these studies were conducted in water and six in water/sediment systems. However Schäfers (2002) had already summarised the results of these studies. Consequently, a detailed species sensitivity distribution which takes into account acute toxicity data for relevant exposure scenarios for different freshwater invertebrate species was developed by Schäfers (2002). An $HC_5$ of 12.7 µg/L was obtained. Schafers proposed an ecologically acceptable concentration of 10 µg/L, and considered it as being sufficiently conservative and representative of all the sensitive aquatic invertebrates. The results from Schäfers (2002) and Havens (1995) were considered by the PMRA in the choice of a toxicity endpoint for the revised risk assessment of freshwater invertebrates.

Available data indicate that the sensitivity of marine invertebrates to carbaryl falls into two groups. Mysid shrimps are most susceptible (1.2-32 µg/L) unlike oysters (> 1000 µg/L). Available toxicity data on marine invertebrates will be used for buffer zone calculations for marine habitats as the use of data from freshwater species would not be appropriate.

Taking all available information into consideration the following aquatic invertebrate's toxicity endpoints were used for the aquatic risk assessment and the revised buffer zone calculations:

- freshwater invertebrates $LC_{50}$=10 µg ai/L (based on mesocosm study by Havens)
- marine invertebrates $1/2LC_{50}$=3.1 µg ai/L. This is a geometrical mean of toxicity endpoints from two studies on mysid shrimp ($LC_{50}$ of 6.7 and 5.7).

## 2.2 Aerial Buffer Zone Calculations

**Comment:**
The registrant disagreed with the water content used in calculating aerial buffer zones (0% based on buffer calculation workbook provided by PMRA), which is not different from content on the product's Statement of Control Specification Form. Swath displacement was not considered in calculating buffer zones by the agency. This is not a realistic assumption.

In addition, the registrant proposed to consider the performance of AGDISP (agricultural dispersal) model in making buffer zone decisions. Research has demonstrated that AGDISP over-predicts deposition and therefore, over-predicts the buffer zones in a great extent.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA had recalculated the no-spray buffer zones resulting from aerial application based on the water content of the formulation. The revised aquatic toxicity endpoints were also used in the buffer zone calculations.

The PMRA agrees that applicators use swath displacement; however, it varies considerably according to meteorological conditions, most notably the wind speed. The 0 m swath displacement in the model input indicates that spray deposition is to the edge of the target area

and as such, the aerial applicators will adjust their off-set flight-line to achieve this deposit. If the PMRA assumed a ½ swath displacement as the standard, then a ½ swath displacement would be prescribed on product labels. In any event, the buffer zone distance would be the ½ swath displacement distance plus the predicted buffer zone value thus it is more appropriate to simply give the buffer zone distance based on a 0 m swath displacement.

The overestimation of no-spray buffer zones in the far field by both AgDrift and AgDISP has been known for some time. There have been numerous discussions, both national and international, regarding this phenomenon but there has been no mechanism to address this issue or agreement on how this issue should be addressed within the model. Modifications to the existing aerial models would be necessary to address the over-prediction in buffer zone distances for aerial application; however, it is not within PMRA's prerogative to bridge the discrepancy between predicted and observed spray deposit or to modify the existing models for any given chemical. In order to be consistent the same approach is needed for all assessments.

### 2.3 Buffer Zone for Tobacco

**Comment:**
The most common method of applying carbaryl to tobacco is with a ground boom sprayer. There were no buffer zones for tobacco identified in the re-evaluation document other than for aerial application.

**PMRA Response:**
Buffer Zones for ground application on tobacco are included in the buffer zone table in Appendix V.

### 2.4 Buffer Zones for the Use of Carbaryl on Apple

**Comment**: Many stakeholders indicated that the buffer zones for apple use, especially for apple thinning, are too big and not practical. They also indicated that typical number of application for apple thinning is only once per year.

**PMRA Response:**
As the PRVD was published in 2009, the buffer zones were calculated according to application rates, numbers and intervals recommended on the label at that time.

Based on use information received during the comment period and the revised application rates for apple thinning (see 1.2.3 of Appendix I in this document), the buffer zones were recalculated and are presented in Appendix V.

### 2.5 Bee Precaution Statement

The registrant proposed a number of significant changes in the apple thinning section of SEVIN BRAND XLR PLUS CARBARYL INSECTICIDE including the following additional honey bee precautionary statements:

**BEE CAUTION**: This product is highly toxic to honey bees exposed to direct treatment on blooming crops or weeds. However, field studies have shown that Sevin XLR CARBARYL INSECTICIDE LIQUID SUSPENSION, while toxic to honey bees, is less hazardous than other carbaryl products when direct application to bees is avoided and the spray residues have dried. For maximum honey bee hazard reduction, apply Sevin XLR CARBARYL INSECTICIDE LIQUID SUSPENSION from late evening to early morning or when bees are not forag'ng. If application must be made during foraging periods, the following precautionary measures should be performed prior to treatment to minimize honey bee kill: notify beekeepers to: (1) confine the honey bees to the hive by covering the colony or screening the entrance; or (2) locate hives beyond honey bee flight range from the treated area. Precautionary measures may be discontinued after spray residues have dried. Leafcutter bees are more sensitive to insecticides than honey bees. Carbaryl applications should be avoided where these bees are foraging.

**PMRA Response:**

The PMRA does not accept this label amendment. As a result of the pollinator risk assessment, it was determined that the application of carbaryl during bloom should be prohibited for a number of crops in order to reduce pollinator exposure. Additional label statements with respect to pollinators are presented in Appendix V. The label requirements take into consideration the protection of managed bees by prohibiting application during bloom for crops which use managed bees for pollination services. These requirements also consider the protection of non-managed bees by prohibiting application during bloom for crops which present a high likelihood of exposure (for both *apis* and non-*apis* bees). In addition, the label requirements refer to a link which informs users of best management practices during spraying, and these practices will also aid in further reducing exposure.

The wording to be implemented by PMRA will be applicable to all labels and is based on exposure potential for pollinators.

## 3.0 Comments Pertaining to the Value Assessment

The PMRA received several comments from stakeholders regarding the value of the carbaryl uses in response to PRVD2009-14. The comments were considered for the refinement of the mitigation measures and in the value assessment to identify crops with pest management concerns.

### 3.1 Use of Carbaryl on Apples

**Comments:**
Carbaryl is primarily used as an apple thinner and is the primary product used on apples for this purpose. There are no suitable alternative active ingredients to carbaryl for thinning apples, nor are any currently under development.

Carbaryl is also needed for late season control of white apple leafhopper. Endosulfan is the only alternative active ingredient registered to control this pest.

**PMRA Response:**

The risk assessment for apple thinning was revised and refined based on updated use information, revised application rates and other information provided by registrants and stakeholders (see Section of 1.2.3 of Appendix I of this document). Additional label amendments will also clarify the use of carbaryl and provide growers with the flexibility to apply carbaryl in a manner appropriate to the thinning requirements in their orchard. The revised use directions are provided in Appendix V.

Alternative active ingredients to carbaryl are registered for use in Canada to control white apple leafhopper on apples. These are listed in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1 Registered Commercial Class Alternative Active Ingredients to Carbaryl for the Control of White Apple Leafhopper on Apples as of August 2015**

| Crop | Pest | Resistance Management Group MoA:[1] Registered alternatives[2] | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Apple | White apple leafhopper | 1A: methomyl, oxamyl (non-bearing apples), formetanate hydrochloride | Methomyl is currently under re-evaluation. |
| | | 1B: diazinon | As published in REV2013-01 *Diazinon Risk Management Plan*, all uses of diazinon on apples will be phased out 31 December 2016. |
| | | 3: cypermethrin, deltamethrin, lambda-cyhalothrin, permethrin | Cypermethrin, deltamethrin, lambda-cyhalothrin and permethrin are currently under re-evaluation. Repeated applications of synthetic pyrethroids may cause secondary pest outbreaks (for example, mites). |
| | | 4: acetamiprid, clothianidin, imidacloprid, thiacloprid | Clothianidin and imidacloprid are currently under re-evaluation. |
| | | 28: chlorantraniliprole (rapporteur), cyantraniliprole | |
| | | Other: kaolin clay | |

[1] Insecticide and Acaricide Resistance Management Group Numbers based on Regulatory Directive DIR 99-06, *Voluntary Pesticide Resistance Management Labelling based on Target Site Mode of Action*, with updates from the Insecticide Resistance Action Committee (IRAC) Mode of Action Classification Scheme v7.4, May 2015. Available at http://www.irac-online.org/documents/moa-classification. 1A = acetylcholinesterase inhibition (carbamates), 1B = acetylcholinesterase inhibition (organophosphates), 3 = sodium channel modulators, 4 = nicotinic acetylcholine receptor competitive modulators, 28 = ryanodine receptor modulators.

[2] This is a list of registered alternatives, current as of August 2015. The registration status of active ingredients under re-evaluation may change pending the final regulatory decision. For additional information, consult the Pesticides and Pest Management portion of Health Canada's website at http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pubs/pest/_decisions/index-eng.php (English) and http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pubs/pest/_decisions/index-

to.php (French) for Re-evaluation Decisions (RVD) and RRD documents; and Re-evaluation Notes (REV documents) at http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pest/part/consultations/index-eng.php (English) and http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pest/part/consultations/index-fra.php (French) for current and past consultation documents including Proposed Re-evaluation Decisions (PRVD) and PACR documents; and certain Re-evaluation Notes (REV documents).

## 3.3 Use of Carbaryl on Turf

**Comments:**
Carbaryl is registered to control a wide range of insect pests on turf. For some of these pests there are few, if any, registered alternative active ingredients. For certain turf pests (for example, ants, chinch bug, cutworms and sod webworm), carbaryl is necessary for rotation with active ingredients from differing resistance mode of action (MoA) groups.

For the control of leatherjackets (European crane fly), carbaryl is the only active ingredient registered on residential turf and is the main active ingredient used on golf courses and turf farms. There are no biological control agents for the control of this pest.

European chafer is a new pest in British Columbia and is currently confined to turf in Vancouver and adjacent areas. Controlling the pest population in turf will delay the spread of this pest into agricultural production areas.

Carbaryl and chlorpyrifos are the only active ingredients available for the control of lawn moth grub larvae and mature leatherjacket larvae. Chlorpyrifos is not registered for use in residential areas.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA will cancel carbaryl use on turf due to risk concerns. Several alternative active ingredients to carbaryl (a group 1A insecticide) for control of turf pests is available from a number of resistance management mode of action groups, including the organophosphates (group 1B), synthetic pyrethroids (group 3), nicotinic acetylcholine receptor competitive modulator (group 4), nicotinic acetylcholine receptor allosteric modulators (group 7) and ryanodine receptor modulators (group 28). The registered alternative active ingredients to carbaryl for the control of European chafer, Japanese beetle, leatherjackets and other turf pests are listed in Table 3.2.

The PMRA notes that there are some use limitations to the registered alternative active ingredients including:

- a seasonal maximum limit of one application for each of imidacloprid, clothianidin and chlorantraniliprole;
- the limit of a single application per season for clothianidin and imidacloprid precludes their use to control both the European chafer and leatherjackets on the same turf in a given season, as the timing of application for these pests differs and clothianidin and imidacloprid may not be used on the same area of turf within the same season in order to prevent the development of resistance.

Parasitic nematodes are available for control of both the European chafer and leatherjackets, however, there are limitations to their use. Applicators require substantial knowledge of the pest biology for proper application timing and sufficient irrigation is required following application if effective reduction in pest populations is to be achieved. As nematodes are live organisms, proper handling and storage is required to maintain their viability. Furthermore, reduction in pest populations using nematodes will not prevent damage immediately after application. For turf where there is a very low tolerance for damage (for example, golf greens) the use of nematodes may not be feasible.

For leatherjackets, there are few registered alternatives. As indicated in RVD 2008-3 *Chlorpyrifos*, chlorpyrifos is limited to use on golf courses, rights of way and other non-residential turf areas. Chlorantraniliprole (MoA group 28) is the only alternative product to carbaryl to come with the IRAC MoA group 4 insecticides for insecticide resistance management on residential turf.

European chafer and Japanese beetle may be controlled by a preventative application prior to, or at egg hatch, or by a curative application after egg hatch to control larvae. Alternative active ingredients to carbaryl that may be applied at either timing include clothianidin and chlorantraniliprole. Imidacloprid is registered as a preventative application however it cannot be applied in the same season as clothianidin.

**Table 3.3 Registered Commercial Class Alternative Active Ingredients to Carbaryl for the Control of Insect Pests on Turf as of August 2013**

| Group | Pest | Resistance Management Group MoA:[1] Registered alternatives[2] | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Turf | European crane fly (leatherjacket) | 4A: chlorpyrifos & clothianidin, imidacloprid<br><br>28: chlorantraniliprole | Clothianidin and imidacloprid are currently under re-evaluation.<br><br>Chlorpyrifos is applied to the late fall after adults have ceased flying (and the laying of eggs has finished). Chlorpyrifos is used to control the young larvae of the subsequent generation. Chlorpyrifos is registered for use on golf courses, industrial sites, highway medians and sod farms only.<br><br>Clothianidin may be applied at the full price to egg hatch (for control of young larvae) or in the spring to control larger larvae prior to pupation. Clothianidin is registered for one application per year. For resistance management purposes it should not be applied with another group 4 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | insecticide in the same season.<br><br>Imidacloprid is registered for suppression of the early fall larval stages of leatherjackets. Only one application per year is registered. If a previous application to turf was made with imidacloprid for control of Japanese beetle, European chafer or black turfgrass ataenius then imidacloprid may not be used to control leatherjackets in the same year. Imidacloprid may not be used on turf previously treated in the same year with a group 4 insecticide.<br><br>Chlorantraniliprole is applied between September and November |
| | European chafer, Japanese beetle | 4: clothianidin, imidacloprid<br><br>28: chlorantraniliprole | Clothianidin, imidacloprid and thiamethoxam are currently under re-evaluation.<br><br>Clothianidin is applied to turf as a preventative and curative treatment. Preventative treatments begin when first adults appear and continue through peak egg hatch. Curative treatments are applied after egg hatch or when damage is observed from the current generation.<br><br>Imidacloprid application is made prior to egg hatch (preventative treatment) and will provide suppression only.<br><br>Thiamethoxam is timed from peak adult flight to peak egg hatch.<br><br>Chlorantraniliprole is applied to turf as a preventative and early curative treatment from early April to late August. |
| | Ants | 1B: chlorpyrifos<br>3: deltamethrin, lambda cyhalothrin | Chlorpyrifos is registered for use on golf courses, industrial sites, highway medians and sod farms only. |
| | Chinch bug | 1B: chlorpyrifos<br>3: deltamethrin<br>4: clothianidin<br>Other: *Metarhizium anisopliae* | Clothianidin, deltamethrin and lambda-cyhalothrin are currently under re-evaluation.<br><br>One application of chlorantraniliprole may be made per season. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Cutworms | 1B: chlorpyrifos<br>3: deltamethrin<br>28: chlorantraniliprole | Deltamethrin is registered for use in Eastern Canada and British Columbia only.<br><br>*Metarhizium anisopliae* is registered for suppression of hairy chinch bug only. |
| | Sod webworms | 1B: chlorpyrifos<br>3: deltamethrin<br>5: spinosad | |

[1] Insecticide and Acaricide Resistance Management Group Numbers based on DIR 99-06, *Voluntary Pesticide Resistance Management Labelling based on Target Site/Mode of Action*, with updates from the Insecticide Resistance Action Committee (IRAC) Mode of Action Classification Scheme v7.4 May 2015. Available at http://www.irac-online.org/documents/moa-classification/. 1B = acetylcholinesterase inhibitors; 3 = sodium channel modulators; 4 = nicotinic acetylcholine receptor competitive modulators; 5 = nicotinic acetylcholine receptor allosteric modulators; 28 = ryanodine receptor modulators.

[2] This is a list of registered alternatives, current as of August 2015. The registration status of active ingredients under re-evaluation may change pending the final regulatory decision. For additional information, consult the Pesticides and Pest Management portion of Health Canada's website: http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pubs/pest/_decisions/index-eng.php (English) and http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pubs/pest/_decisions/index-fra.php (French) for Re-evaluation Decisions (RVD and RRD documents) and Re-evaluation Notes (REV documents) or http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pest/part/consultations/index-eng.php (English) and http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pest/part/consultations/index-fra.php (French) for current and past consultation documents including Proposed Re-evaluation Decisions (PRVD and PACR documents) and certain Re-evaluation Notes (REV documents).

### 3.3 Use of Carbaryl in the Ornamental Landscape Industry and in Forestry for the Control of Mountain Pine Beetle

**Comments:**
Carbaryl is needed for the control of mountain pine beetle on high value ornamental trees and in forestry. In British Columbia, carbaryl has been critical to protecting pine trees in nurseries, golf courses, residential properties and other locations during the current outbreak of mountain pine beetle.

Carbaryl is critical to the ornamental industry for the control of Japanese beetle and gypsy moth which are identified by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) as quarantine pests.

Carbaryl is also needed for the control of ash plant bug, blister beetles, boxelder bug, elm leaf beetle, elm spanworm, flea beetles, leafhoppers, leafrollers, mountain pine beetle, black vine weevil, June beetle, psyllids, rose chafer, scale crawlers and willow leaf beetle on ornamental plants.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA acknowledges that there are limited registered alternative active ingredients to carbaryl for the control of mountain pine beetle in Western Canada including British Columbia. Currently, chlorpyrifos (limited to forestry use) and verbenone are the registered alternative active ingredients to carbaryl. In addition, it is noted that for some ornamental pests there are few registered alternatives (for example, for blister beetle, cankerworm, Eriophyid mites, flea beetle or leafrollers), or there are no registered alternative active ingredients to carbaryl (boxelder bug, June beetle and rose chafer).

Furthermore, the PMRA recognizes that several of the registered alternative active ingredients to carbaryl are currently under re-evaluation and may be registered for use only on a few of the ornamental crops listed on the carbaryl product labels or may have other use limitations.

### 3.4 Carbaryl Use on Tobacco

**Comment:**
Carbaryl is used for control of hornworm and flea beetle on flue-cured tobacco in the field. There are few registered alternative active ingredients to carbaryl.

**PMRA Response:**
Information received in response to PRVD2009-14 resulted in refinement of the risk assessment for tobacco. As a result, the restricted-entry intervals were reduced and deemed by the PMRA to be agronomically feasible. Therefore, tobacco will remain in the registered use pattern of carbaryl.

### 3.5 Carbaryl Use on Grape

**Comments:**
Carbaryl is critical for control of leafhoppers on grapes. The other registered alternative active ingredients are not as effective as carbaryl to control this pest and are more costly.
Neonicotiniods are persistent and negatively impact predaceous thrips and mites leading to secondary pest outbreaks of phytophagous mites. Some European countries have temporarily suspended the use of neonicotinoids (due to sudden bee colony collapse disorder) and this may impact export of Canadian wines due to concerns about neonicotinoid residues.

**PMRA Response:**
The registered alternative active ingredients to carbaryl for the control of leafhoppers on grapes are listed in Table 3.5. The PMRA acknowledges that the alternative active ingredients may be more costly and that repeated use of a single active ingredient or active ingredients within one resistance mode of action group may result in secondary pest outbreaks and promote the development of resistance.

**Table 3.5 Alternative Active Ingredients to Carbaryl for the Control of Leafhoppers on Grapes Registered in Canada as of August 2015**

| Crop | Pest | Resistance Management Group MoA:[1] Registered alternatives[2] | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grape | Leafhoppers | 1B:, malathion<br><br>3: cypermethrin, permethrin, pyrethrins | Clothianidin, cypermethrin, imidacloprid, permethrin and pyrethrins are currently under re-evaluation. |

| Crop | Pest | Resistance Management Group MoA:[1] Registered alternatives[2] | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 4: acetamiprid, clothianidin, imidacloprid, sulfoxaflor<br><br>Other: kaolin clay | |

[1] Insecticide and Acaricide Resistance Management Group Numbers based on DIR 99-06, *Voluntary Pesticide Resistance Management Labelling based on Target Site/Mode of Action*, with updates from the Insecticide Resistance Action Committee (IRAC) Mode of Action Classification Scheme v7.4 May 2015. Available at http://www.irac-online.org/documents/moa-classification/. 1B = acetylcholinesterase inhibitors; 3 = sodium channel modulators; 4 = nicotinic acetylcholine receptor competitive modulator.

[2] This is a list of registered alternatives, current as of August 2015. The registration status of active ingredients under re-evaluation may change pending the final regulatory decision. For additional information, consult the Pesticides and Pest Management portion of Health Canada's website: http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pubs/pest/_decisions/index-eng.php (English) and http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pubs/pest/_decisions/index-fra.php (French) for Re-evaluation decisions (RVD and RRD documents) and Re-evaluation notes (REV documents) or http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pest/part/consultations/index-eng.php (English) and http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pest/part/consultations/index-fra.php (French) for current and past consultation documents including Proposed Re-evaluation Decisions (PRVD and PACR documents) and certain Re-evaluation notes (REV documents).

### 3.6 Carbaryl use for the control of (striped) cucumber beetle and climbing cutworms on cucumber, melon, pumpkin and squash

**Comment:**
Use of carbaryl for the control of cucumber beetle and climbing cutworm is critical until a suitable alternative active ingredient is available at a comparable price.

**PMRA Response:**
Information received in response to PRVD2009-14, resulted in refinement of the risk assessment for cucumber, melon, pumpkin and squash. As a result, the restricted-entry intervals were reduced and deemed to be agronomically feasible by the PMRA. Therefore, these uses will remain in the registered use pattern of carbaryl.

### 3.7 Carbaryl use on cole crops (broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage, cauliflower, and kohlrabi)

**Comment:**
Carbaryl is required for resistance management of crucifer pests.

**PMRA Response:**
Information received in response to PRVD2009-14, resulted in refinement of the risk assessment for kohlrabi. As a result, the restricted-entry intervals were reduced and deemed to be

agronomically feasible by the PMRA. Therefore, kohlrabi will remain in the registered use pattern of carbaryl. Registered alternative active ingredients are available from several resistance mode of action groups for the control of diamondback moth, imported cabbageworm and cabbage looper on broccoli, Brussels sprouts, cabbage, cauliflower and kale. However, there are few viable alternative active ingredients for the control of leafhoppers. Chlorantraniliprole is the only alternative active ingredient to carbaryl for control of armyworm and corn earworm. Management of the development of resistance to this active ingredient is a concern for growers. There are no registered alternative active ingredients to carbaryl for the control of meadow spittle bug, *Lygus* bug and stink bugs on cole crops. The PMRA also recognises that some of the registered alternative active ingredients to carbaryl have limitations, and that several of these active ingredients are currently under re-evaluation.

### 3.8 Carbaryl Use in Residential Areas and the Impact on Agriculture from the Rural and Urban Interface

**Comments:**
Removal of the residential uses of carbaryl will negatively impact cherry growers where there is a rural and urban interface. Cherry growers adjacent to residential areas will be impacted by greater pest pressure from residential trees acting as a source of pests (particularly cherry fruit fly). There are no viable alternatives to carbaryl for the control of fruit tree pests on residential fruit trees. Residential yards acting as a source of pests may affect other crops as well.

**PMRA Response:**
The PMRA acknowledges that residential fruit trees may act as a source of insect pests that could infest orchards, particularly where residential yards are adjacent to production areas. Fruit tree hosts in residential areas which may harbour pests that could infest cherry orchards include:

- stone fruit: apricot, cherry, peach, plum; and
- pome fruit: apple and pear.

Use of pesticides to control fruit tree pests in residential areas may be subject to provincial or municipal regulations. These regulations may restrict or prohibit the use of pest control products in residential areas. Alternative pest control products to the Domestic Class carbaryl products include:

- Commercial Class products such as acephate, acetamiprid, malathion, permethrin, insecticidal soap and mineral oil that may be applied by a licensed applicator; and
- Domestic Class products that may be applied by the homeowner, including malathion, permethrin, pyrethrin, spinosad, Bacillus thuringiensis var kurstaki, insecticidal soap and mineral oil.

There are no other registered Domestic Class products for the control of cherry fruit fly or apple maggot on cherry, plum, and pears aside from the Domestic Class carbaryl products. However, Commercial Class products are available.

### 3.9 Carbaryl Use on Cherry

**Comments:**
Carbaryl is needed for control of cherry fruit flies on cherries. The options for cherry fruit fly control are limited based upon offshore market restrictions to the maximum residue limits, and the availability of alternative active ingredients from differing resistance mode of action (MoA) group for rotation to prevent development of resistance.

**PMRA Response:**
Alternative active ingredients to carbaryl are available from several insecticide resistance modes of action. The registered alternative active ingredients to carbaryl for the control of cherry fruit fly are listed in Table 3.9.

**Table 3.9 Alternative Active Ingredients to Carbaryl for the Control of Cherry Fruit Fly on Cherries in Canada as of August 2015**

| Crop | Pest | Resistance Management Group MoA:[1] Registered alternatives[2] | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cherry | Cherry fruit fly | 1B: diazinon, dimethoate, phosmet<br>3: lambda-cyhalothrin<br>4: acetamiprid, imidacloprid<br>5 spinosad<br>28: chlorantraniliprole (suppression), cyantraniliprole | As indicated in REV2013-01 *Diazinon Risk Management Plan*, foliar applications of diazinon on cherry crops will be phased out December 31, 2016.<br><br>Dimethoate is limited to two applications per season.<br><br>Phosmet is registered for use on sour cherries only.<br><br>Dimethoate, lambda-cyhalothrin and imidacloprid are currently under re-evaluation.<br><br>Acetamiprid and chlorantraniliprole are registered for suppression only. |

[1] Insecticide and Acaricide Resistance Management Group Numbers based on DIR 99-06 *Voluntary Pesticide Resistance Management Labelling based on Target Site/Mode of Action*, with updates from the Insecticide Resistance Action Committee (IRAC) Mode of Action Classification Scheme v7.4 May 2015. Available at http://www.irac-online.org/documents/moa-classification/. 1B = acetylcholinesterase inhibitors (organophosphates); 3 = sodium channel modulators; 4 = nicotinic acetylcholine receptor competitive modulator; 5 = nicotinic acetylcholine receptor allosteric modulator; 28 = ryanodine receptor modulators.

[2] This is a list of registered alternatives, current as of August 2015. The registration status of active ingredients under re-evaluation may change pending the final regulatory decision. For additional information, consult the PMRA publications website: http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pubs/pest/_decisions/index-eng.php (English) and http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pubs/pest/_decisions/index-fra.php (French) for Re-evaluation Decisions (RVD and RRD documents) and Re-evaluation Notes (REV documents) or http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-spc/pest/part/consultations/index-eng.php (English) and http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/cps-

spc/pest/part/consultations/index-fra.php (French) for current and past consultation documents including Proposed Re-evaluation Decisions (PRVD and PACR documents) and certain Re-evaluation Notes (REV documents).

### 3.10 Carbaryl Use on Carrot

**Comments:**
Sevin is the only product registered for the control of six spotted leafhopper (aster leafhoppers) which is a vector of aster yellows disease. There are no rotational products currently available to control this pest. Three applications of carbaryl may not be sufficient to provide season long control of this pest.

**PMRA Response:**
Information received in response to PRVD2009-14, resulted in refinement of the risk assessment for carrot. As a result, the restricted-entry intervals were reduced and deemed to be agronomically feasible by the PMRA. Therefore, carrots will remain in the registered use pattern of carbaryl.

# Appendix II Registered Carbaryl Products as of November 20151

| Registrant Number | Registrant | Product Name | Guarantee (%) [2] | Formulation Type[3] | Marketing Class[4] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16653 | Bayer CropScience Inc. | Sevin T&O Insecticide | CAB-43 | SU | C+R |
| 19351 | Bayer CropScience Inc. | Sevin Brand 97.5% Manufacturing Concentrate | CAB-97.5 | SO | M |
| 22339 | Bayer CropScience Inc. | Chipco Sevin RP2 Carbaryl Insecticide Liquid Suspension | CAB-22.5 | SU | C |
| 25870 | Bayer CropScience Inc. | Sevin RP2 Domestic Carbaryl Insecticide Liquid Suspension | CAB-22.5 | SU | D |
| 26873 | Bayer CropScience Inc. | Chipco Sevin T&O Carbaryl Insecticide | CAB-42.8 | SU | C |
| 30614 | Bayer CropScience Inc. | Sevin Brand Carbaryl Technical | CAB-99.5 | SO | T |
| 9042 | Dominion Veterinary Laboratories Limited | Sevin Dispersible Powder Insecticide (For Veterinary Use Only) | CAB-50 | DU | C |
| 9061 | Dominion Veterinary Laboratories Limited | Dominion Dusting Powder For Veterinary Use Only | CAB-5 | DU | C |
| 9986 | King Home & Garden Inc. | King Fruit Tree & Garden Spray | MAL-5; CAP-10; CAB-10 | DU | D |
| 14851 | King Home & Garden Inc. | Gardal Rose, Flower, & Evergreen Dust | TPM-3; MAL-4; CAP-5; CAB-5 | DU | D |
| 29616 | King Home & Garden Inc. | King Bug Killer Insecticide Dust | CAB-5.0 | DU | D |
| 29619 | King Home & Garden Inc. | King PTV Potato, Tomato & Vegetable Dust For Bugs And Blights | CUB-7.0; CAB-5.0 | DU | D |
| 29623 | King Home & Garden Inc. | King Ant & Earwig Killer Dust | CAB-5.0 | DU | D |

| Registrant Number | Registrant | Product Name | Guarantee (%) [2] | Formulation Type[3] | Marketing Class[4] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6839 | Tessenderlo Kerley Inc. | Sevin Brand 50W Carbaryl Insecticide Wettable Powder | CAB-50 | WP | C+R |
| 18463 | Tessenderlo Kerley Inc. | Sevin Brand Technical Carbaryl Insecticide | CAB-99.5 | SO | T |
| 19531 | Tessenderlo Kerley Inc. | Sevin Brand XLR Plus Carbaryl Insecticide | CAB-42.8 | SU | C+R |
| 24973 | Tessenderlo Kerley Inc. | Sevin Bran Bait Carbaryl Insecticide | CAB-5 | PT | C |
| 27876 | Tessenderlo Kerley Inc. | Sevin Xlr Carbaryl Insecticide Liquid Suspension | CAB-42.8 | SU | C+R |
| 17534 | Agrium Advanced Technologies RP Inc. | Farm & Ranch Brand Sevin 5-D Insecticide Dust | CAB-5 | DU | C |
| 25815 | Peacock Industries | Eco Bran Grasshopper Insecticide Agricultural | CAB-2 | GR | C |
| 10565 | Sure-Gro IP Inc. | Wilson Rose Doctor Insecticide-Fungicide | MAL-4; FOL-5; CAB-5 | DU | D |
| 12135 | Sure-Gro IP Inc. | Wilson Sevin Garden Dust Insecticide | CAB-5.0 | DU | D |
| 14852 | Sure-Gro IP Inc. | Wilson Bulb & Soil Dust | CAP-5; CAB-5 | DU | D |
| 17424 | Sure-Gro IP Inc. | Wilson Garden Doctor Insecticide-Fungicide | CUB-7; CAB-5 | DU | D |
| 17971 | Sure-Gro IP Inc. | Wilson Liquid Sevin Carbaryl Insecticide | CAB-22.5 | SU | D |
| 19228 | Sure-Gro IP Inc. | Wilson Earwig & Cutworm Destroyer | CAB-5 | GR | D |

| Registrant Number | Registrant | Product Name | Guarantee (%) [1] | Formulation Type[2] | Marketing Class[4] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26698 | Sure-Gro IP Inc. | Wilson Scvin Grubout Ant & Grub Killer Concentrate | CAB-22.5 | EC | D |
| 26699 | Sure-Gro IP Inc. | Wilson Scvin Grubout Ant & Grub Killer | CAB-22.5 | EC | D |
| 26702 | Sure-Gro IP Inc. | Wilson Anout Ant Killer Attach And Spray | CAB-22.5 | EC | D |
| 26923 | Sure-Gro IP Inc. | Wilson Anout Ant Killer Dust | CAB-5.0 | DU | D |
| 27206 | Scotts Canada Ltd. | Ortho Grub-B-Gon Max Grub Eliminator Ready-To-Spray | CAB-22.5 | SU | D |
| 27207 | Scotts Canada Ltd. | Ortho Bug-B-Gon Max Ant & Chinch Bug Eliminator Ready-To-Spray | CAB-22.5 | SN | D |
| 27208 | Scotts Canada Ltd. | Ortho Bug-B-Gon Max Ant And Chinch Bug Eliminator Concentrate | CAB-22.5 | SN | D |

[1] Excluding discontinued products and products with a submission for discontinuation.

[2] Formulation types based on PMRA database: DU = Dust or Powder, EC = Emulsifiable Concentrate or Emulsion, GR = Granular, SN = Solution, SO = Solid, SU = Suspension, WP = Wettable Powder.

[3] CAB = Carbaryl, CAP = Captan, CUB = Copper, present as basic copper sulfate, FOL = Folpet, MAL = Malathion, TPM = Thiophanate-Methyl.

[4] C = Commercial Class Products, D = Domestic Class Products, T = Technical Class, M = Manufacturing Concentrate, R = Restricted Class.

# Appendix III – Revised Mixer/Loader/Applicator Exposure Estimates

## Table III.1 Revised M/L/A Exposure Estimates and ARI Using Updated Application Rates for Uses to Be Cancelled

| Crop | Form [a] | Application Equipment [b] | Application Rates [c] (kg a.i./ha) | Area treated per day [d] (ha) | Daily Exposure (µg/kg/day) | | Margins of Exposure | | Aggregate Risk Indices [f] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Dermal [e] | Inhalation [f] | Dermal [g] | Inhalation [h] | |
| Mixing and Loading: Closed system for suspensions, water soluble packaging for wettable powder; PPE: regardless of formulation: chemical resistant coveralls over a single layer, chemical resistant gloves.<br>Aerial Applications: Single layer, no gloves.<br>Airblast applications: Open cab, chemical resistant coveralls over a single layer, chemical resistant gloves, chemical resistant headwear. | | | | | | | | | |
| pears | SU | aerial - M/L | 1.728 | 200 | 58.21 | 0.54 | 929 | 2080 | 2.70 |
| | | aerial - Apply | | | 47.69 | 0.55 | 764 | 5270 | 2.51 |
| | | airblast | 2.910 | 16 | 46.72 | 3.93 | 776 | 287 | 1.36 |
| | WP | airblast | | | 66.02 | 3.98 | 806 | 284 | 1.38 |
| apricot, peach | SU | airblast | 2.910 | 16 | 46.72 | 3.93 | 776 | 287 | 1.36 |
| | WP | airblast | | | 66.02 | 3.98 | 806 | 284 | 1.38 |
| corn (field, sweet) | SU | aerial - M/L | 1.92 | 400 | 106.03 | 1.48 | 340 | 768 | 0.99 |
| | | aerial - Apply | | | 170.93 | 0.54 | 277 | 1201 | 0.85 |
| | | groundboom | | 150 | 30.03 | 0.70 | 711 | 1111 | 2.06 |
| | WP | groundboom | | | 39.50 | 1.00 | 856 | 1135 | 2.57 |
| cherries, plums | SU | aerial - M/L | 2.910 | 200 | 64.35 | 0.55 | 552 | 1270 | 1.60 |
| | | aerial - Apply | | | 80.52 | 0.56 | 662 | 1962 | 1.97 |
| | | airblast | | 16 | 46.72 | 3.93 | 776 | 287 | 1.36 |
| cherries, plums, prunes | WP | airblast | 2.910 | 16 | 66.02 | 3.98 | 806 | 284 | 1.38 |

[a] WP = Wettable Powder (For the purpose of exposure mitigation, assumed to be in Water Soluble Packaging); SU = Suspension; M/L = Mix and Load.
[b] Rate in kilograms of active ingredient per hectare (kg a.i./ha).
[c] Based on default assumptions, see PRVD 2009-14 for details.
[d] Where dermal exposure µg/kg/day = unit exposure × area treated × rate) 70 kg bw.
[e] Where inhalation exposure µg/kg/day = (unit exposure × area treated × rate) 70 kg bw.
[f] Based on a dermal $NOEL_{rat}$ of 35.5 mg/kg bw/day and a target dermal MOE of 300. Dermal Margin of Exposure ($MOE_{derm}$) = $NOEL_{rat}$ (mg/kg/day) ÷ Dermal Exposure (mg/kg/day).
[g] Based on an oral $NOEL_{rat}$ of 1.13 mg/kg bw/day and a target MOE of 100. Inhalation Margin of Exposure ($MOE_{inh}$) = $NOEL_{rat}$ (mg/kg/day) ÷ Inhalation Exposure (mg/kg/day).
[h] Aggregate Risk Index = 1 / ((1/Dermal Risk Index) + (1/Inhalation Risk Index)). Shaded cells indicate an aggregate risk index (ARI) that failed to meet the target of 1.0. An ARI < 1.0 does not represent a risk of concern.

**Table III.2 Revised M/L/A Exposure Estimates and ARIs using Updated Application Rates for Uses to be Retained**

| Crop | Form [a] | Application Equipment [b] | Application Rates [c] (kg a.i./ha) | Area treated per day [d] (ha) | Daily Exposure (µg/kg/day) | | Margins of Exposure | | Aggregate Risk Indices [i] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Dermal [e] | Inhalation [f] | Dermal [g] | Inhalation [h] | |
| Mixing and Loading: Closed systems for suspensions, water soluble packaging for wettable powder. PPE regardless of formulation: chemical resistant coveralls over a single layer, chemical resistant gloves.<br>Aerial Applications: Single layer, no gloves.<br>Airblast Applications: Open cab, chemical resistant coveralls over a single layer, chemical resistant headgear, chemical resistant gloves.<br>Groundboom Applications: Closed cab, cotton coveralls over a single layer, no gloves. | | | | | | | | | |
| apple thinning (high density orchards) | SU | airblast | 1.5 | 16 | 23.57 | 2.03 | 1906 | 558 | 2.64 |
| tapestraw (canola) | SU | aerial - M/L | 0.233 | 400 | 12.62 | 0.18 | 2812 | 6298 | 8.16 |
| | | aerial - Apply | | | 15.76 | 0.11 | 2253 | 9898 | 6.98 |
| | | groundboom | | 300 | 12.14 | 0.17 | 2924 | 6657 | 8.50 |
| tobacco | SU | aerial - M/L | 1.2815 | 400 | 69.43 | 0.99 | 511 | 1145 | 1.48 |
| | | aerial - Apply | | | 86.66 | 0.63 | 410 | 1800 | 1.27 |
| | | groundboom | | 300 | 66.78 | 0.93 | 532 | 1210 | 1.55 |
| | WP | groundboom | 1.125 | 300 | 46.29 | 1.17 | 767 | 968 | 2.02 |

[a] WP = Wettable Powder (For the purpose of exposure mitigation, assumed to be in Water Soluble Packaging); SU = Suspension; M/L = Mix and Load.
[c] Rate in kilograms of active ingredient per hectare (kg a.i./ha).
[d] Based on default assumptions, see PRVD 2009-14 for details.
[e] Where dermal exposure µg/kg/day = unit exposure × area treated × rate/ 70 kg bw.
[f] Where inhalation exposure µg/kg/day = (unit exposure × area treated × rate)/70 kg bw.
[g] Based on a dermal $BMDL_{10}$ of 35.5 mg/kg bw/day and a target dermal MOE of 300. Dermal Margin of Exposure (MOE$_{Derm}$) = $BMDL_{10}$ (mg/kg/day) / Dermal Exposure (mg/kg/day).
[h] Based on an oral $BMDL_{10}$ of 1.13 mg/kg bw/day and a target MOE of 100. Inhalation Margin of Exposure (MOE$_{Inh}$) = $BMDL_{10}$ (mg/kg/day) / Inhalation Exposure (mg/kg/day).
[i] Aggregate Risk Index = 1 / ((1/Dermal Risk Index)+(1/Inhalation Risk Index)). As ARI / 1.0 does not represent a risk of concern.

# Appendix IV Revised Postapplication Exposure Estimates

## Table IV.1 Revised Postapplication Exposure Estimates, MOEs and REIs based on Updated Use Information for Uses to be Cancelled

| Crop | Applications per Year | | Rates [c] (kg a.i./ha) | Activity | Transfer Coefficient ($cm^2$/hr) [d] | DFR [e] (µg/ $cm^2$) | Dermal Exposure [f] (µg/kg bw/day) | MOE [g] | REI [h] (days) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number [a] | Interval [b] (days) | | | | | | | |
| alfalfa, clover | 2 | 7 | 2.52 | scouting | 1100 | 0.93 | 116.84 | 304 | 8 |
| apples (insecticide use), pears, apricot, peach, cherries, plums | 2 | 11 | 2.91 | thinning | 3000 | 0.34 | 116.07 | 306 | 30 |
| | | | | hand harvesting | 1500 | 0.70 | 120.21 | 295 | 23 |
| | | | | hand line irrigation | 1100 | 0.96 | 120.45 | 295 | 20 |
| | | | | hand pruning, scouting, pinching, tying, training | 500 | 1.98 | 113.40 | 313 | 13 |
| | | | | mechanical harvesting (cherries) | 200 | 5.06 | 115.69 | 307 | 4 |
| barley, oats, rye, wheat | 2 | 7 | 2.52 | scouting | 1100 | 0.93 | 116.84 | 304 | 8 |
| broccoli, Brussel sprouts, cabbage | 2 | 7 | 2.52 | hand harvest | 5150 | 0.19 | 109.63 | 324 | 14 |
| | | | | hand weeding, thinning, topping | 4400 | 0.23 | 113.29 | 313 | 13 |
| | | | | scouting, tying | 4000 | 0.23 | 102.99 | 345 | 13 |
| | | | | irrigation | 1100 | 0.85 | 107.24 | 331 | 6 |
| | | 5 | 2.50 | hand harvest | 5150 | 0.18 | 108.76 | 326 | 14 |
| | | | | hand weeding, thinning, topping | 4400 | 0.22 | 112.39 | 316 | 13 |
| | | | | scouting, tying | 4000 | 0.22 | 102.17 | 347 | 13 |
| | | | | irrigation | 1100 | 0.85 | 106.39 | 334 | 6 |
| cauliflower | 2 | 7 | 2.52 | hand weeding, thinning, topping | 4400 | 0.23 | 113.29 | 313 | 13 |
| | | | | hand harvest, scouting | 1300 | 0.71 | 104.78 | 339 | 7 |
| | | | | irrigation | 1100 | 0.85 | 107.24 | 331 | 6 |
| | | 5 | 2.50 | hand pruning, hand harvest | 4400 | 0.22 | 112.39 | 316 | 13 |
| | | | | scouting | 1300 | 0.70 | 103.95 | 342 | 7 |
| | | | | weeding, thinning, irrigation | 1100 | 0.85 | 106.39 | 334 | 6 |

**Table IV.1 Revised Postapplication Exposure Estimates, MOEs and REIs for Uses to be Cancelled (cont'd)**

| Crop | Applications per Year | | Rates [c] (kg a.i./ha) | Activity | Transfer Coefficient ($cm^2$/hr) [d] | DFR [e] (µg/ $cm^2$) | Dermal Exposure [f] (µg/kg bw/day) | MOE [g] | REI [h] (days) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number [a] | Interval [b] (days) | | | | | | | |
| corn (sweet & field) | 2 | 2 | 1.92 | hand harvesting (sweet corn only) | 17000 | 0.06 | 117.68 | 302 | 20 |
| | | | | scouting | 1100 | 0.87 | 109.27 | 325 | 7 |
| | | | | irrigation | 1000 | 1.07 | 121.92 | 291 | 6 |
| | | | | hand weeding | 100 | 3.65 | 41.69 | 852 | 0.5 |
| peppers | r.a.n. (repeat as necessary) | 7 | 3.07 | hand weeding, thinning | 4400 | 0.23 | 114.18 | 311 | 14 |
| | | | | hand harvest, scouting | 1300 | 0.71 | 105.61 | 336 | 8 |
| | | | | irrigation | 1100 | 0.86 | 108.08 | 328 | 7 |
| strawberries | 2 | 7 | 3.00 | hand harvest, pinching, pruning, training, irrigation | 1000 | 0.90 | 103.03 | 345 | 9 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 4.64 | 106.14 | 334 | 1 |
| | | | | hand weeding, thinning | 100 | 5.70 | 65.14 | 545 | 0.5 |
| sweet white lupin | 2 | 7 | 1.86 | scouting | 1100 | 0.84 | 106.08 | 335 | 7 |
| | | | | harvesting, irrigation | 1000 | 1.04 | 118.37 | 300 | 6 |
| | | | | weeding, thinning | 100 | 3.54 | 40.47 | 877 | 0.5 |

[a] The number of applications for fruit trees was reduced from r.a.n. to 2 per year based on comment received from Bayer CropScience (BCS) (01/14/11). The number of applications for all other crops was limited to 2 per year based on the available DFR data.

[b] A minimum interval of seven days between applications was assumed in the risk assessment for those applications to trees where an interval was not specified. A seven or eight day interval was applied to all other crops based on the available DFR data.

[c] Maximum listed label rates expressed in kilograms a.i./hectare. The application rates for canola, tobacco and fruit trees were reduced in accordance to comments received from BCS (06/10/09 & 14/01/11).

[d] Transfer coefficients are from the Science Advisory Council for Exposure Agricultural Transfer Coefficient document (Revised – 7 August 2000) and any

amendments thereof (USEPA, 2000; PMRA document number 2115788).
[e] DFR is based on DFR data (see PRVD 2009-14), at × days after application, where × is the day when an MOE ≥300 is determined.
[f] Dermal exposure = DFR × TC × 8 hr / 70 kg.
[g] The resulting MOE on the recommended REI day. Based on the short and intermediate term dermal $BMDL_{10}$ of 35.5 mg/kg/day and a dermal target MOE of 300.
[h] Day at which the dermal exposure results in an MOE ≥300.

**Table IV.2 Revised Postapplication Exposure Estimates, MOEs and REIs for Uses to be Retained**

| Crop | Applications per Year | | Rates [c] (kg a.i./ha) | Activity | Transfer Coefficient ($cm^2$/hr) [d] | DFR [e] (µg/ $cm^2$) | Dermal Exposure [f] (µg/kg bw/day) | MOE [g] | REI [h] (days) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number [a] | Interval [b] (days) | | | | | | | |
| apples (for thinning in orchards that have transitioned to high density trellis production) | 1 | 1 | 1.50 | hand thinning | 3000 | 0.34 | 115.74 | 307 | 21 |
| | | | | hand thinning | 3000 | 0.70 | 239.73 | 148 | 14 |
| | | | | hand harvest | 1500 | 0.70 | 119.87 | 296 | 14 |
| | | | | hand line irrigation | 1100 | 0.96 | 120.10 | 296 | 11 |
| | | | | hand pruning, scouting, pinching, tying, training | 500 | 1.98 | 113.08 | 314 | 4 |
| apples ( for thinning in orchards that have not transitioned to high density trellis production) | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | hand thinning | 3000 | 0.34 | 116.98 | 303 | 17 |
| | | | | hand harvest | 1500 | 0.71 | 121.15 | 293 | 10 |
| | | | | hand line irrigation | 1100 | 0.87 | 109.39 | 325 | 8 |
| | | | | hand pruning, scouting, pinching, tying, training | 500 | 2.00 | 114.29 | 311 | 0.5 |
| asparagus and asparagus ferns | 2 | 3 | 3.07 | irrigation | 1000 | 1.04 | 118.84 | 299 | 6 |
| | | | | hand weeding | 100 | 2.69 | 30.76 | 1154 | 0.5 |
| beans | 2 | 7 | 3.07 | scouting | 1100 | 0.86 | 108.08 | 328 | 7 |
| | | | | hand harvest, irrigation | 1000 | 1.04 | 118.84 | 299 | 6 |
| | | | | hand weeding | 100 | 0.23 | 2.60 | 13680 | 0.5 |
| beet (root), horseradish, radish, rutabaga (root), salsify (root), turnip (root) | 2 | 7 | 2.52 | hand harvest, irrigation | 1000 | 1.03 | 117.91 | 301 | 5 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 2.67 | 61.04 | 582 | 0.5 |
| | | | | hand weeding, thinning | 100 | 2.21 | 25.23 | 1407 | 0.5 |
| | 2 | 5 | 2.25 | hand harvest, irrigation | 1000 | 0.92 | 105.28 | 337 | 5 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 2.38 | 54.50 | 651 | 0.5 |
| | | | | hand weeding, | 100 | 2.38 | 27.25 | 1303 | 0.5 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | thinning | | | | | |
| berries | 2 | 7 | 2.52 | hand harvest, pinching, pruning, training | 1500 | 0.62 | 105.76 | 336 | 10 |
| | | | | irrigate, weed, scout, thin | 700 | 1.40 | 112.02 | 317 | 6 |

**Table IV.2: Revised Postapplication Exposure Estimates, MOEs and REIs for Uses to be Retained (cont'd)**

| Crop | Applications per Year | | Rates [a] (kg a.i./ha) | Activity | Transfer Coefficient ($cm^2$/hr) [d] | DFR [e] ($\mu g/cm^2$) | Dermal Exposure [f] (µg/kg bw/day) | MOE [g] | REI [h] (days) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number [a] | Interval [b] (days) | | | | | | | |
| blueberries | 2 | 10 | 1.99 | hand harvest, pinching, pruning, training | 1500 | 0.60 | 102.51 | 346 | 9 |
| | | | | irrigate, weed, scout, thin | 700 | 1.36 | 108.57 | 327 | 5 |
| carrots | 2 | 7 | 2.52 | hand harvest, irrigation | 10000 | 1.03 | 117.91 | 301 | 5 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 2.67 | 61.04 | 582 | 0.5 |
| | | | | weeding, thinning | 100 | 2.21 | 25.23 | 1407 | 0.5 |
| | | 5 | 2.25 | hand harvest, irrigation | 10000 | 0.92 | 105.28 | 337 | 5 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 2.38 | 54.50 | 651 | 0.5 |
| | | | | weeding, thinning | 100 | 1.97 | 22.53 | 1576 | 0.5 |
| celery, lettuce, kohlrabi | 2 | 7 | 2.52 | hand harvest, hand pruning, irrigation | 10000 | 1.03 | 117.91 | 301 | 5 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 2.67 | 61.04 | 582 | 0.5 |
| | | | | hand weeding, thinning | 100 | 2.67 | 30.52 | 1163 | 0.5 |
| | | 5 | 2.50 | hand harvest, hand pruning, irrigation | 10000 | 1.02 | 116.97 | 303 | 5 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 2.65 | 60.55 | 586 | 0.5 |
| | | | | hand weeding | 100 | 2.65 | 30.28 | 1173 | 0.5 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | thinning | | | | | |
| cranberries | 2 | 7 | 3.0(2) | irrigation, pruning, harvesting | 10000 | 0.50 | 102 (67) | 2450 | 10 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 0.00 | 1107 (17) | 2150 | 2 |
| | | | | weeding, thinning | 1000 | 0.50 | 70(23) | 6000 | 0.5 |
| cucumbers, melons, squash, pumpkins | 2 | 7 | 1.2(2) | hand-line irrigation | 11000 | 0.50 | 115 (82) | 2012 | 2 |
| | | | | hand harvest | 8000 | 1.50 | 1251 (11) | 2502 | 0.5 |
| | | | | turning, tying, stalking | 3700 | 1.50 | 82 (26) | 4250 | 0.5 |
| | | | | scouting, weeding | 1000 | 1.50 | 179 (18) | 2150(2) | 0.5 |
| eggplants | 6 (4,6) | 7 | 3.0(2) | hand-line irrigation | 11000 | 0.50 | 1108 (18) | 2120 | 7 |
| | | | | hand harvest | 8000 | 1.20 | 1104 (90) | 2000 | 5 |
| | | | | turning, tying, stalking | 3700 | 1.60 | 1173 (67) | 2017 | 2 |
| | | | | scouting, weeding | 1000 | 2.20 | 257 (20) | 9054 | 0.5 |

**Table IV.2: Revised Postapplication Exposure Estimates, MOE's and REIs for Uses to be Retained (cont'd)**

| Crop | Applications per Year | | Rates[1] (lbs a.i./lbs) | Activity | Transfer Coefficients (cm²/hr)[2] | DFR[3] (ug/cm²) | Dermal Exposure[4] (ug/kg bw/day) | MOE[5] | REI[6] (days) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number[1] | Interval[1] (days) | | | | | | | |
| baby vegetables | 2 | 7 | 2.00 | hand harvest, hand pruning, irrigation | 1000 | 1.00 | 107.00 | 800 | 2 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 2.07 | 41.40 | 2800 | 0.5 |
| | | | | hand weeding, thinning | 100 | 2.07 | 20.70 | 5400 | 0.5 |
| | | 5 | 2.00 | hand harvest, hand pruning, irrigation | 1000 | 0.50 | 102.50 | 1007 | 2 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 2.50 | 20.50 | 6021 | 0.5 |
| | | | | hand weeding, thinning | 100 | 2.50 | 17.25 | 12000 | 0.5 |
| parsnips | 2 | 7 | 2.00 | hand harvest, hand pruning, irrigation | 1000 | 1.00 | 1106.07 | 800 | 2 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 2.50 | 55.25 | 2000 | 0.5 |
| | | | | hand weeding, thinning | 100 | 2.50 | 20.625 | 11000 | 0.5 |
| peas | 2 | 7 | 2.00 | hand harvest, irrigation | 1000 | 0.50 | 102.50 | 1007 | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | weeding | 200 | 2.38 | 54.50 | 651 | 0.5 |
| | | | | thinning, hand weeding | 100 | 2.38 | 27.25 | 1303 | 0.5 |
| potato | 2 | 7 | 3.07 | irrigation | 1000 | 1.04 | 118.84 | 299 | 6 |
| | | | | weeding | 200 | 3.26 | 74.41 | 477 | 0.5 |
| | | | | hand weeding | 100 | 2.69 | 30.76 | 1154 | 0.5 |
| rapeseed (canola) | 2 | 7 | 0.23 | weeding | 1100 | 0.44 | 55.65 | 638 | 0.5 |
| | | | | irrigation | 1000 | 0.44 | 50.59 | 702 | 0.5 |
| soybeans (*seed beans TC) | 2 | 7 | 2.85 | weeding | 1100 | 0.83 | 104.11 | 341 | 6 |
| | | | | hand harvest, irrigation | 1000 | 1.00 | 114.47 | 310 | 5 |
| | | | | hand weeding | 100 | 2.59 | 29.63 | 1198 | 0.5 |

**Table IV.2: Revised Postapplication Exposure Estimates, MOEs and REIs for Uses to be Retained (cont'd)**

| Crop | Applications per Year | | Rates [c] (kg a.i./ha) | Activity | Transfer Coefficient ($cm^2$/hr) [d] | DFR [e] (µg/ $cm^2$) | Dermal Exposure [f] (µg/kg bw/day) | MOE [g] | REI [h] (days) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number [a] | Interval [b] (days) | | | | | | | |
| strawberries | 2 | 7 | 3.00 | hand harvest, pinching, pruning, training, irrigation | 1000 | 0.90 | 103.03 | 345 | 9 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 4.64 | 106.14 | 334 | 1 |
| | | | | hand weeding, thinning | 100 | 5.70 | 65.14 | 545 | 0.5 |
| tobacco | 2 | 7 | 1.28 | harvesting, irrigation | 800 | 1.32 | 120.38 | 295 | 3 |
| | | | | scouting, weeding, pruning | 100 | 2.43 | 27.82 | 1276 | 0.5 |
| | | | 1.13 | harvesting, irrigation | 800 | 1.16 | 105.68 | 336 | 3 |
| | | | | scouting, weeding, pruning | 100 | 2.14 | 24.43 | 1453 | 0.5 |
| tomato | 2 | 7 | 3.07 | hand harvest, tying, pruning, irrigation | 1000 | 1.04 | 118.84 | 299 | 6 |
| | | | | scouting | 200 | 3.26 | 74.41 | 477 | 0.5 |
| | | | | thinning, hand weeding, staking | 100 | 3.26 | 37.20 | 954 | 0.5 |

[a] The number of applications for fruit trees was reduced from r.a.n. to 2 per year based on comment received from BCS (01/14/11). The number of applications for all other crops was limited to 2 per year based on the available DFR data.

[b] A minimum interval of seven days between applications was assumed in the risk assessment for those applications to trees where an interval was not specified. A seven or eight day interval was applied to all other crops based on the available DFR data.

[c] Maximum listed label rates expressed in kilograms a.i./hectare. The application rates for canola, tobacco and fruit trees were reduced in accordance to comments received from BCS (06/10/09 & 14/01/11).

[d] Transfer coefficients are from the Science Advisory Council for Exposure Agricultural Transfer Coefficient document (Revised – 7 August 2000) and any amendments thereof (USEPA, 2000; PMRA document number 2115788).

[e] DFR is based on DFR data (see PRVD 2009-14), at × days after application, where × is the day when an MOE ≥300 is determined.

[f] Dermal exposure = DFR × TC × 8 hr / 70 kg.

[g] The resulting MOE on the recommended REI day. Based on the short and intermediate term dermal $BMDL_{10}$ of 35.5 mg/kg/day and a dermal target MOE of

300. Shaded cells indicate those MOEs that failed to reach the target MOE of 300. Apple thinning exposure based on the unmodified orchard thinning transfer coefficient (TC) of 3000 $cm^2/h$ . This TC over-estimates dermal postapplication exposure fororchards that have transitioned to high density trellis production. However, the degree of over-estimation cannot be quantified.

[h] Day at which the dermal exposure results in an MOE ≥300.

### Table IV.3 Worker Postapplication Exposure and MOEs on Sod Farm and Golf Course Turfs

| Activities [a] | Label REI | REI | Transfer Coefficient ($cm^2/hr$) | TTR Data [b] % TTR | Dermal Exposure [c] Absorbed (µg/kg/d) | Dermal MOE [d] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sod Farms** (Short-term exposure): | | | | | | |
| Harvesting treated turf | 0 | | 6800 | 1.65 | 1782.37 | 20 |
| | | 26 | | 0.11 | 115.16 | 308 |
| Mowing, watering, irrigation | 0 | | 3500 | 1.65 | 917.40 | 39 |
| | | 20 | | 0.20 | 111.53 | 318 |
| Aerating, fertilizing, hand pruning, mechanical weeding, scouting, seeding | 0 | | 500 | 1.65 | 131.06 | 271 |
| | | 1 | | 1.49 | 117.95 | 301 |
| **Golf Courses** (Short-term exposure): | | | | | | |
| Harvesting and transplanting treated turf | 0 | | 6800 | 1.65 | 1782.37 | 20 |
| | | 26 | | 0.11 | 115.16 | 308 |
| Mowing, watering, cup changing, irrigation repair, miscellaneous grooming | 0 | | 3500 | 1.65 | 917.40 | 39 |
| | | 20 | | 0.20 | 111.53 | 318 |
| Aerating, fertilizing, hand pruning, mechanical weeding, scouting, seeding | 0 | | 500 | 1.65 | 131.06 | 271 |
| | | 1 | | 1.49 | 117.95 | 301 |

[a] Postapplication activities and subsequent Transfer Coefficients are based on the December 2008 PMRA memo: Interim Transfer Coefficients (TCs) for Golf Courses and Sod Farm Postapplication Activities.

[b] Chemical specific data from Turf Transferable Residue study assuming a 10% dissipation rate.

[c] Dermal exposure = % TTR × rate of 139 $\mu g/cm^2$ × TC × 8 hr duration / 70 kg BW.

[d] Based on a dermal $BMDL_{10}$ of 35.5 mg/kg/day; target MOE for acute and short-term estimates is 300. Shaded cells indicate those MOEs that failed to meet the target of 300.

# Appendix V Label Amendments for Commercial Class Products Containing Carbaryl

Note: The label amendments presented below do not include all label requirements for individual end-use products, such as first aid statements, disposal statements, precautionary statements and supplementary protective equipment. Additional information on labels of currently registered products should not be removed unless it contradicts the label statements below.

---

Based on the toxicological assessments, the label text of the carbaryl-containing products should be expanded and/or standardized, as follows:

**TOXICOLOGICAL INFORMATION**

Carbaryl is a carbamate which is a cholinesterase inhibitor. Typical symptoms of overexposure to cholinesterase inhibitors include malaise, muscle weakness, dizziness and sweating. Headache, salivation, nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain and diarrhea are often prominent. A life-threatening poisoning is signified by loss of consciousness, incontinence, convulsions and respiratory depression with a secondary cardiovascular component. Treat symptomatically. If exposed, plasma and red blood cell cholinesterase tests may indicate degree of exposure (baseline data are useful). However, if a blood sample is taken several hours after exposure, it is unlikely that blood cholinesterase activities will be depressed, due to rapid reactivation of cholinesterase. Atropine, only by injection, is the preferable antidote. Do not use pralidoxime. In cases of severe acute poisoning, use antidotes immediately after establishing an open airway and respiration. With oral exposure, the decision of whether to induce vomiting or not should be made by an attending physician.

**Add to ENVIRONMENTAL PRECAUTIONS:**

**TOXIC** to birds, mammals and aquatic organisms. Observe buffer zones specified under DIRECTIONS FOR USE.

To reduce runoff from treated areas into aquatic habitats, consider the characteristics and conditions of the site before treatment. Site characteristics and conditions that may lead to runoff include, but are not limited to: heavy rainfall, moderate to steep slope, bare soil, poorly draining soil (e.g. soils that are compacted or fine textured such as clay).

Contamination of aquatic areas as a result of runoff may be reduced by including a vegetative strip between the treated area and the edge of the water body.

Avoid application of this product when heavy rain is forecast.

---

**Pollinators:**

TOXIC to bees. Bees may be exposed through direct spray, spray drift, and residues on leaves, pollen and nectar in flowering crops and weeds. Minimize spray drift to reduce harmful effects on bees in habitats close to the application site. Avoid applications when bees are foraging in the treatment area in ground cover containing blooming weeds. To further minimize exposure to pollinators, refer to the complete guidance "Protecting Pollinators during Pesticide Spraying – Best Management Practices" on the Health Canada website (*www.healthcanada.gc.ca/pollinators*). Follow crop specific directions for application timing.

For applications on crops that are highly attractive to pollinators (asparagus, rapeseed, apple, blackberries, boysenberries, dewberries, loganberries, chokecherries, raspberries, blueberries, cranberries, melons, pumpkin, squash, cucumber, broad beans and outdoor ornamentals and trees (excluding coniferous evergreens), or when using managed bees for pollination services, add the following statements:

- DO NOT apply during the crop blooming period.

For beans (except broad beans as listed above), peas, potato, eggplant, tomato, tobacco, and the following crops when grown for seed: Chinese cabbage, collards, mustard greens, kohlrabi, dandelion, watercress, celery, endive, lettuce, parsley, spinach, Swiss chard, turnip, rutabaga, carrots, beets, parsnip, horseradish, radish, salsify, add the following statements:

- Avoid application during the crop blooming period. If applications must be made during the crop blooming period, restrict applications to evening when most bees are not foraging.

**Add to USE PRECAUTIONS**

The following statements must be added to all current commercial class products labels:

- Not for indoor use.
- This product is not to be used in and around homes or other residential areas such as parks, schools, public buildings, playing fields or any other areas where the general public including children could be exposed.
- Not for use in greenhouses (vegetable or ornamental).
- Not for use on turf, golf courses, sod farms, residential ornamentals or residential vegetable gardens.
- Keep the following personal protective equipment immediately available for use in case of emergency (i.e., a broken package, spill, or equipment breakdown): chemical-resistant coveralls, chemical-resistant gloves, chemical-resistant head gear and a respirator.

For apple thinning, add the following:

- For good hygiene practices, chemical-resistant gloves are recommended when hand thinning apples following an application of carbaryl.

To protect bystander exposure to carbaryl, the following statement must be added to all labels, with the exception of those for bran bait:

- Apply only when the potential for drift to areas of human habitation or areas of human activity (houses, cottages, schools and recreational areas) is minimal. Take into consideration wind speed, wind direction, temperature inversion, application equipment and sprayer settings.

**Engineering Controls and Personal Protective Equipment**

Statements must be amended (or added) to include the following directions to the appropriate labels in order to mitigate the risk of exposure to carbaryl:

**Mixing/Loading**

**A. Mixing and Loading Bran Bait:**
Wear cotton coveralls over long pants and a long-sleeved shirt, shoes plus socks and chemical resistant gloves.
Do not mix and load by hand or with hand held equipment.

**B. Mixing and Loading liquids:**

- Use a closed mixing system.
- Wear chemical resistant coveralls over long pants and a long-sleeved shirt, shoes plus socks and chemical resistant gloves.

**C. Mixing and Loading Wettable Powders in Water Soluble Packaging:**
Wear chemical resistant coveralls over long pants and a long-sleeved shirt, shoes plus socks and chemical resistant gloves.

**Applying**

**A. Applying Bran Bait:**

- Do not apply by hand or handheld equipment. Use an open or closed cab broadcast spreader.
- Wear cotton coveralls over long pants and a long-sleeved shirt, shoes plus socks and chemical resistant gloves.

**B. Applying by air:**
Wear cotton coveralls over long pants and a long-sleeved shirt, shoes plus socks.

**C. Applying by groundboom:**

- During groundboom application use a closed cab that provides both a physical barrier and respiratory protection (i.e., dust/mist filtering and/or vapour/gas purification system). The closed cab must have a chemical resistant barrier that totally surrounds the occupant and prevents contact with pesticides outside the cab.
- Wear cotton coveralls over long pants and a long-sleeved shirt, shoes plus socks and chemical resistant gloves.
- Keep the following personal protective equipment immediately available for use in case of emergency or when exiting the cab with treated areas (i.e., a broken package, spill, or equipment breakdown): chemical-resistant coveralls, chemical-resistant gloves, chemical-resistant head gear and a respirator. Once PPE is worn in a treated area, it must be removed before re-entering the cab.

**D. Applying by airblast:**

- During airblast application use a closed cab that provides both a physical barrier and respiratory protection (i.e., dust/mist filtering and/or vapour/gas purification system). The closed cab must have a chemical resistant barrier that totally surrounds the occupant and prevents contact with pesticides outside the cab. Wear cotton coveralls over long pants and a long-sleeved shirt, shoes plus socks and chemical resistant gloves.
- If a closed cab is not feasible, wear chemical resistant coveralls over long pants and a long-sleeved shirt, shoes plus socks, chemical resistant gloves and chemical-resistant headgear. Chemical resistant headgear includes So'Westers, or large brimmed, water-proof hats, and hoods with sufficient neck protection. Avoid touching face or other unprotected parts of the body during application.
- Keep the following personal protective equipment immediately available for use in case of emergency or when exiting the cab with treated areas (i.e., a broken package, spill, or equipment breakdown): chemical-resistant coveralls, chemical-resistant gloves, chemical-resistant head gear and a respirator. Once PPE is worn in a treated area, it must be removed before re-entering the cab.

**E. Applying by right-of-way sprayer:**
Wear chemical resistant coveralls over long pants and a long-sleeved shirt, shoes plus socks and chemical resistant gloves.

**F. Applying by handheld equipment:**
Wear chemical resistant coveralls over long pants and a long-sleeved shirt, shoes plus socks, chemical resistant gloves and NIOSH approved respiratory protection.

**DIRECTION FOR USE**

The following uses should be removed from all current labels:

- Indoor pest control uses including greenhouses, residences, food and feed handling establishments and barns and livestock production areas;
- Aerosol products;
- Agricultural dust uses;
- Bran bait application to residential gardens;
- Livestock for food;
- Livestock for non-food;
- Companion animals (including pet collars);
- Granular bait products for ornamental gardens;
- Applications by hand, spoon and bellygrinder;
- All commercial applications to residential areas (turf, ornamentals, fruit trees, and vegetable gardens);
- alfalfa, apples (insect control only), apricot, balsam fir, barley, broccoli, brussels sprouts, cabbage, cauliflower, cherries, clover, corn (sweet & field), farm woodlots, grapes, kale, municipal parks, oats, peach, pears, peppers, plums, rights-of-way for control of spruce budworm, residential ornamentals and residential vegetable gardens, rye, snapbeans (hand harvest only), spruce, strawberries, sweet white lupin, turf (lawns, golf courses & sod farms) and wheat.

The following amendments must be made to the appropriate labels:

- For canola, the new maximum label rate is 0.233 kg a.i./ha.

- For tobacco, the new maximum label rate is 1.28 kg a.i./ha (solutions) and 1.13 kg a.i./ha for (wettable powders), two applications, 7 days apart.

**Revised Restricted-Entry Intervals (REIs)**

The restricted-entry intervals listed below must be added to the appropriate labels.

| Crop | Activity | REI [1] (days) |
|---|---|---|
| apples (orchards that have transitioned to high density trellis production)<br>Max. application rate: 1.5 kg a.i./ha (chemical thinning application) | Hand harvest | 14 |
| | Hand thinning, hand-line irrigation | 14 |
| | Hand pruning, scouting, pinching, tying, training | 4 |
| apples (orchards that have not transitioned to high density trellis production)<br>Max. application rate: 1.0 kg a.i./ha (chemical thinning application) | Hand harvest | 17 |
| | Hand thinning, hand-line irrigation | 10 |
| | Hand pruning, scouting, pinching, tying, training | 0.5 |
| asparagus and asparagus ferns | High contact activities (irrigation) | 6 |
| | Low contact activities (hand weeding) | 0.5 |
| beans | High contact activities (scouting, hand harvest, irrigation) | 7 |
| | Low contact activities (hand weeding) | 0.5 |
| beet (root/top), horseradish, radish, rutabaga (root), salsify (root/top), turnip (root/top) | High contact activities (hand harvest, irrigation) | 5 |
| | Low contact activities (scouting, hand weeding, thinning) | 0.5 |
| blackberry, boysenberry, dewberry, loganberry, raspberry | High contact activities (hand harvest, pinching, pruning, training) | 10 |
| | Low contact activities (irrigation, weeding, scouting, thinning) | 6 |
| blueberries | High contact activities (hand harvest, pinching, pruning, training) | 9 |
| | Low contact activities (irrigation, weeding, scouting, thinning) | 5 |
| bran bait applications | All activities | 0.5 |
| carrots | Low contact activities (scouting, weeding, thinning) | 0.5 |
| cranberries | High contact activities (irrigation, pruning, harvesting) | 10 |
| | Low contact activities (scouting, weeding, thinning) | 2 |
| cucumbers, melons, squash, pumpkins | High contact activities (hand-line irrigation) | 7 |
| | Low contact activities (hand harvest, turning, tying, staking, scouting, weeding) | 0.5 |
| choke cherries | All activities | 21 |
| ditch banks, forage grasses, pastures | All activities | 2 |
| eggplants | High contact activities (hand harvest, hand-line irrigation) | 7 |
| | Low contact activities (scouting turning, weeding, tying, staking) | 3 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| forests | All activities | 0.5 |
| green ash | All activities | 2.6 |
| high value trees | All activities | 7 |
| Chinese cabbage, dandelion, endives, lettuce, collards, mustard greens, parsley, spinach, Swiss chard, and watercress celery, kohlrabi | High contact activities (hand harvest, hand pruning, irrigation) | 5 |
| | Low contact activities (scouting, hand weeding, thinning) | 0.5 |
| ornamental trees | All activities | 28 |
| ornamental shrubs and flowers | All activities | 12 |
| parsnips | High contact activities (hand harvest, hand pruning, irrigation) | 5 |
| | Low contact activities (scouting, hand weeding, thinning) | 0.5 |
| peas | High contact activities (hand harvest, irrigation) | 5 |
| | Low contact activities (scouting, thinning, hand weeding) | 0.5 |
| potatoes | High contact activities (irrigation) | 6 |
| | Low contact activities (scouting, hand weeding) | 0.5 |
| rapeseed (canola) | All activities (scouting, irrigation) | 0.5 |
| root crops | All activities | 10 |
| raspberries | High contact activities (scouting, irrigation) | 6 |
| | Low contact activities (hand weeding, mechanical harvest) | 0.5 |
| tobacco | High contact activities (harvesting, irrigation) | 5 |
| | Low contact activities (scouting, weeding, pruning) | 0.5 |
| tomatoes | High contact activities (tying, hand harvest, pruning, irrigation) | 6 |
| | Low contact activities (scouting thinning, hand weeding, staking) | 0.5 |
| trap trees | All activities | 7 |

[1] Day at which the dermal exposure results in an MOE = 300.

**Number of Applications:**
Consult the table below for the number of applications per year and application intervals per crop:

**Applications per Year and Application Intervals**

| Crops | Applications per Year | |
|---|---|---|
| | Number | Interval (days) |
| apples (chemical thinning application) | 1 | N/A |
| trap trees; cherry chemical; high value trees | 1 | N/A |
| ditch banks, forage grasses and pastures, rapeseed (canola); blackberries, boysenberries, dewberries, loganberries, raspberries, blueberries, cranberries, | 2 | 6 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| tobacco | | |
| beet (root/top), Chinese cabbage, dandelion, collards, endive, mustard greens, parsley, salsify (root/top), spinach, Swiss chard, turnip (root/top), watercress, parsnips, asparagus, celery, lettuce, kohlrabi, beans, horseradish, radish, rutabaga (root), carrots, peas, potatoes, sugarcane (mechanical harvesting only), tomato, eggplants, cucumbers, melons, pumpkin, squash, scallop, carnation, chrysanthemums, gladiolus, holly, hydrangea, lilac, rose, zinnia, green ash | 5 | 7 |
| forests, arboretums, birch, boxwood, dogwood, elm, juniper, maple, oak, pines, ornamental trees, tree bait application (non-residential) | 5 | 7 |

**Add to DIRECTIONS FOR USE (Pollinator statements):**

*Appropriate restrictions should be repeated under the specific crop use directions, as follows.*

*To protect pollinators, follow the instructions regarding bees in the Environmental Precautions section.*

*For asparagus, rapeseed (canola), apple, blackberries, boysenberries, dewberries, loganberries, chokecherries, raspberries, blueberries, cranberries, melons, pumpkin, squash, cucumber, broad beans and outdoor ornamentals and trees (excluding coniferous evergreens), add the following statements:*

- TOXIC to bees. DO NOT apply during the crop blooming period.

*For beans (except broad beans as listed above), peas, potato, eggplant, tomato, tobacco, and the following crops when grown for seed: Chinese cabbage, collards, mustard greens, kohlrabi, dandelion, watercress, celery, endive, lettuce, parsley, spinach, Swiss chard, turnip, rutabaga, carrots, beets, parsnip, horseradish, radish, salsify, add the following statements:*

- TOXIC to bees. Avoid application during the crop blooming period. If applications must be made during the crop blooming period, restrict applications to evening when most bees are not foraging. When using managed bees for pollination services, DO NOT apply during the crop blooming period.

**Add to DIRECTIONS FOR USE:**

*Field sprayer application*: **DO NOT** apply during periods of dead calm. Avoid application of this product when winds are gusty. **DO NOT** apply with spray droplets smaller than the American Society of Agricultural Engineers (ASAE) fine classification. Boom height must be 60 cm or less above the crop or ground.

Airblast application: **DO NOT** apply during periods of dead calm. Avoid application of this product when winds are gusty. **DO NOT** direct spray above plants to be treated. Turn off outward pointing nozzles at row ends and outer rows. **DO NOT** apply when wind speed is greater than 16 km/h at the application site as measured outside of the treatment area on the upwind side.

Aerial application: **DO NOT** apply during periods of dead calm. Avoid application of this product when winds are gusty. **DO NOT** apply when wind speed is greater than 16 km/h at flying height at the site of application. **DO NOT** apply with spray droplets smaller than the American Society of Agricultural Engineers (ASAE) fine classification. To reduce drift caused by turbulent wingtip vortices, the nozzle distribution along the spray boom length **MUST NOT** exceed 65% of the wing- or rotorspan.

***Buffer zones:***

Use of the following spray methods or equipment **DO NOT** require a buffer zone: hand-held or backpack sprayer and spot treatment.

The buffer zones specified in the table below are required between the point of direct application and the closest downwind edge of sensitive freshwater habitats (such as lakes, rivers, sloughs, ponds, prairie potholes, creeks, marshes, streams, reservoirs and wetlands) and estuarine/marine habitats.

| Method of application | Crop | | Buffer Zones (metres) Required for the Protection of: | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Freshwater Habitat of Depths: | | Estuarine/Marine Habitats of Depths: | |
| | | | Less than 1 metre | Greater than 1 metre | Less than 1 metre | Greater than 1 metre |
| Field sprayer | Asparagus (seedling), beans, beet, blackberry, blueberry, boysenberry, canola, carrot, Chinese cabbage, celery, chokecherry, collards, cucumber, dandelion, eggplant, endive, kohlrabi, lettuce, loganberry, melon, mustard greens, parsley, parsnip, peas, potato, pumpkin, radish, raspberry, rutabaga, salsify, snapbeans, spinach, squash, Swiss chard, turnip, tomato and watercress | | 10 | 3 | 15 | 10 |
| | Ditch banks, field borders, wastelands, headlands, forage grass, pasture, rangeland, asparagus (ferns), cranberry, ornamentals | | 15 | 4 | 25 | 10 |
| | Tobacco | | 25 | 5 | 35 | 15 |
| Airblast | Apple (apple thinning only) | Early growth stage | 25 | 10 | 30 | 20 |
| | Ornamentals | Early growth stage | 45 | 30 | 50 | 40 |
| | | Late growth stage | 35 | 20 | 40 | 30 |
| Aerial | Blueberries | Fixed wing | 700 | 100 | 800 | 575 |
| | | Rotary wing | 675 | 75 | 800 | 525 |
| | Forage, field crops, and vegetable crops | Fixed wing | 750 | 225 | 800 | 600 |
| | | Rotary wing | 675 | 125 | 800 | 550 |
| | Cranberries | Fixed wing | 775 | 350 | 800 | 600 |
| | | Rotary wing | 650 | 300 | 800 | 550 |
| | Forest, woodlands | Fixed wing | 800 | 350 | 800 | 725 |
| | | Rotary wing | 375 | 125 | 450 | 275 |

For tank mixes, consult the labels of the tank-mix partners and observe the largest (most restrictive) buffer zone of the products involved in the tank mixture and apply using the coarsest spray (ASAE) category indicated on the labels for those tank mix partners.

The buffer zones for this product can be modified based on weather conditions and spray equipment configuration by accessing the Buffer Zone Calculator on the Pest Management Regulatory Agency web site.

**Apple Thinning:**

**The use directions for apple thinning on Sevin Brand 50W (Reg. No. 6839) label must be removed.**

**For apple thinning use on the current labels (Sevin Brand XLR Plus (Reg. No. 19531) and Sevin XLR (Reg. No. 27876)): Add the following to DIRECTIONS FOR USE:**

"TO REDUCE FRUIT SET — APPLE TREES (FRUIT):

APPLICATION RATE AND TIMING
For orchards that have transitioned to high density trellis production architecture (e.g., spindle or super spindle trees) apply 0.5 to 3.22 L/ha as a full coverage spray timed between late petal fall and 25 days after full bloom. The use rate will depend on the apple variety, tree size, row spacing, and the weather conditions at the time of and following application. For easily thinned varieties apply 0.5-1 L of product/1000 L of spray (233–466 g a.i./1000 L). For hard to thin varieties apply 1-2 L of product/1000 L of spray (466–932 g a.i./1000 L). The maximum application rate per growing season is not to exceed 1.5 kg a.i./ha.

For orchards that have not transitioned to high density trellis production architecture (e.g., dwarf, semi-dwarf and full sized trees) apply 0.5 to 2.15 L/ha as a full coverage spray timed between late petal fall and 25 days after full bloom. The use rate will depend on the apple variety, tree size, row spacing, and the weather conditions at the time of and following application. For easily thinned varieties apply 0.5-1 L of product/1000 L of spray (233–466 g a.i./1000 L). For hard to thin varieties apply 1-2 L of product/1000 L of spray (466–932 g a.i./1000 L). The maximum application rate per growing season is not to exceed 1.0 kg a.i./ha.

Apple tree varieties differ in their sensitivity to chemical thinners. Varieties considered easy-to thin, including Ginger Gold, Cortland, and Granny Smith may be adequately thinned with one application. Varieties considered more difficult-to-thin such as Golden Delicious, Red Delicious, Gala, etc. may require an additional application or be combined with another compatible thinner containing benzyladenine or naphthaleneacetic acid.

Pre-harvest interval is 75 days for apple thinning applications.

SPRAY APPLICATION AND VOLUME

Sevin should be applied from the ground using a high volume handgun or airblast sprayer. The sprayer should be properly calibrated to ensure complete coverage of foliage and developing fruit without runoff. It is suggested that nozzles be adjusted to deliver 2/3 of the spray volume in the upper portion of a tree. Reduce spray coverage to the lower portion of the tree since over thinning may occur here. Adjust spray volume to accommodate tree size. The most effective spray volume will depend on the tree size, planting density (row and tree spacing) and amount of foliage. Use sufficient spray volume to ensure adequate coverage; typical spray volume is dependent on tree size (e.g., 1000 to 2000 L/ha). Avoid spray to the point of runoff.

COMPATABILITY WITH OTHER THINNERS

Sevin may be tank mixed with other fruit thinners, such as products containing 6-benzyladenine or naphthaleneacetic acid (NAA) for use on some varieties. However, use caution to avoid over-thinning and other adverse effects. The combination with NAA may result in pygmy or small fruit production on some varieties such as Delicious and Fuji. Consult with local fruit thinning experts for recommendations before using either of these combinations. Refer to and follow the tank mix partner's label for specific use directions and precautions.

PRECAUTIONS FOR APPLE THINNING USE OF SEVIN XLR CARBARYL INSECTICIDE

LIQUID SUSPENSION

- Do not apply during bloom prior to 80% petal fall.
- Weather Influences Thinner Response:
  - Climatic temperature, high humidity, frost, and other weather factors may influence fruit thinning results. When fruit reach a size range of 7 to 14 mm they are most sensitive to thinner application and weather conditions, particularly at 3 to 4 days after application, will influence thinner response. Application made when temperatures are expected to be below 17°C may result in reduced and insufficient thinning. When temperatures are expected to exceed 27°C or when moderate temperatures are accompanied by an extended period (3 to 4 days) of cloudy weather, heavy or excessive thinning may be observed. A good rule-of thumb is once fruit reach 6 to 7 mm in size the most satisfactory thinning is often achieved by making the application right before a period forecasted of at least 3 days of moderate (21°C to 25°C) temperatures.

- Other Factors that Influence Thinner Response:
  - Exercise caution to avoid possible over thinning and possible yield reduction. Tree age, variety, nutrition, previous crop pruning and bloom, and degree of set may influence fruit thinning results.

- Fruit Deformity Precaution:

- The use of Sevin may result in fruit deformity under certain environmental conditions. Before using on any variety of apples, the user must weigh the risk versus benefits when using this product, particularly when using it between 80% petal fall and 6 mm fruit size. Red Delicious is more sensitive to this phenomenon and in particular, the varieties Bisbee, Red Chief and Vallee Spur are very susceptible to conditions causing fruit deformity. Precipitation and temperatures below 18°C increases the possibility of fruit deformity. The use of this product with any spray additive not specifically recommended on the label may increase the risk of fruit deformity and injury.
  Consult with fruit thinning experts in your area for advice on using this product on specific apple varieties under local growing conditions or other questions. Observe all restrictions on the use of this product for apple thinning.

DRIFT MANAGEMENT

For airblast application, observe the following drift management practices:

- Adjust deflectors and aiming devices so that spray is only directed into the canopy;
- Block off upward pointed nozzles when there is no overhanging canopy;
- Do not allow the spray to go beyond the edge of the cultivated area (i.e., turn off sprayer when turning at end rows);
- For applications to the outside rows, only spray inward, toward the orchard."

# Appendix VI Additional Mitigation Measures for Certain Products Containing Carbaryl

**Domestic Class Products**
All domestic class products containing carbaryl are to be cancelled.

The cancellation schedule for all domestic class products is as follows:
Last sale by registrants: 12 months following the publication date of this document
Last sale by retail: 24 months following the publication date of this document
Expiry date of registration: 36 months following the publication date of this document

**Wettable Powder in Water Soluble Packaging (WSP)**
Registrants of end-use product must take measures to package wettable powder products in water soluble packaging and discontinue the wettable powder formulation.

An application to register a new product in water soluble packaging is required within 24 months following the publication date of this document. Label directions for these products must be revised to provide use directions for products in water soluble packaging.

## References

| PMRA Number | Reference |
|---|---|

**A. Information Considered in the Toxicology Assessment**

**Studies/Information Submitted By Applicant/Registrant (Unpublished)**


1533160 2007, Report on Cholinesterase Comparative Sensitivity Study of Carbaryl, DACO: 4.8


**Published Information**


1968927 Herr, David W. et al, 2010, Relationship Between Brain and Plasma Carbaryl Levels and Cholinesterase Inhibition - Toxicology, Volume 276, Pages 172 to 183, DACO: 4.8

2026922 United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2005, Transmittal of Meeting Minutes of the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel Meeting Held December 2, 2004 on the Use of Pharmacokinetic Data to Refine Carbaryl Risk Estimates from Oral and Dermal Exposure, DACO: 12.5.4

2308483 Cambon, C, C. Declume and R. Derache, 1978, Inhibition of Acetylcholinesterase from Foetal and Maternal Tissues after Oral Intake of Carbaryl (1-naphthyl-N-methyl-carbamate) by Pregnant Rats - Biochemical Pharmacology, Volume 27, Pages 2647 to 2648, DACO: 4.5.14

2308485 Cambon, C., C. Declume, and R. Derache, 1980, Foetal and Maternal Rat Brain Acetylcholinesterase: Isoenzymes Changes Following Insecticidal Carbamate Derivatives Poisoning - Archives of Toxicology, Volume 45, Pages 257 to 262, DACO: 4.5.14

2308487 Declume, C. and P. Benard, 1977, Foetal Accumulation of [14C] Carbaryl in Rats and Mice Autoradiographic Study - Toxicology, Volume 8, Pages 95 to 105, DACO: 4.5.9

2308491 Declume, C., C. Cambon, and R. Derache, 1979, The Effects on New-Born Rats of Repeated Carbaryl Administration During Gestation - Toxicology Letters, Volume 3, Pages 191 to 196, DACO: 4.5.14

2308493 United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2002, Carbaryl - 6th Report of the Hazard Identification Assessment Review Committee, DACO: 12.5.4

2308498 Moser, Virginia C. et al, 2010, Time-Course, Dose-Response, and Age Comparative Sensitivity of N-Methyl Carbamates in Rats - Toxicological Sciences, Volume 114, Number 1, Pages 113 to 123, DACO: 4.5.12

2309077 Mortensen, S.R., M.J. Hooper, and S. Padilla, 1998, Rat Brain Acetylcholinesterase Activity: Developmental Profile and Maturational Sensitivity to Carbamate and Oranophosphorus Inhibitors - Toxicology, Volume 125, Pages 13 to 19, DACO: 4.5.12

2309078 Astroff, A.B. et al, 1999, The Conduct of a Two-Generation Reproductive Toxicity Study via Dermal Exposure in the Sprague-Dawley Rat -- A Case Study with KBR 3023 (A Prospective Insect Repellent) - Reproductive Toxicology, Volume 13, Number 3, Pages 223 to 232, DACO: 4.5.1

## B. Information Considered in the Health Exposure Assessment

**Studies/Information Submitted By Applicant/Registrant (Unpublished)**

1812352 Bayer CropScience Canada, 2009. Letter from BCS to J. Worgan, Director General, Re-evaluation Management Directorate, PMRA. "Comments on Carbaryl PRVD 2009-14." 6 October 2009.

2007013 Bayer CropScience Canada, 2011. Letter from BCS to Conti, M. A/Director General, Re-evaluation Management Directorate, PMRA. 'Comments on Carbaryl PRVD 2009-14." January 14, 2011.

1718679 Bayer CropScience Canada, 2007a. Memo (email) from Delaney, N. of Bayer CropScience to R. Vogrig of the PMRA 'Carbaryl Re-evaluation Questions and Response,' Bayer CropScience, Ontario. Unpublished. 8 August 2007.

1812296 Bayer CropScience Canada, 2007b. Lunchick, C. 'Post Application Exposure Estimate Following Application of the Tebuconazole Formulation, Lynx 2, to Golf Courses.' OPPTS 875.2400, Report # G201756. Bayer CropScience, 15 August 2007.

1812211 Krolski, M.E. *et al*, Metabolism of [14C] Carbaryl in Rats, 2003. MRID 46277001. Report # 201025. DACO: 4.5.9. Bayer CropScience, 7 May 2003.

2194662 Akins, J. *et al*, 'Response to PMRA's Apple Thinning Re-entry Interval Assessment and Refinement Options for Carbaryl'. Tessenderlo Kerley Inc., 25 May 2012.

1526175 Dick, I. 2001. [14C]-Carbaryl Comparative *in vitro* Dermal Penetration Study Using Human and Rat Skin. Huntingdon Life Sciences Ltd., Woolley Rd, Alconbury, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire, U.K. Lab Resport # AES 033/012804. 21 September 2001. Unpublished.

2115788 Agricultural Reentry Task Force (ARTF). 2008. Data Submitted by the ARTF to Support Revision of Agricultural Transfer Coefficients. Submission #2006-0257.

1526127 Shah, P.V. 2007. Carbaryl: Review of *in vitro* Dermal Absorption Study: Dick, I. 2001. [14C]-Carbaryl Comparative *in vitro* Dermal Penetration Study Using Human and Rat Skin. Unpublished.

**Additional Information**

**Published Information**

1656343 Chang, S.K., Brooks, J.D., Monteiro-Riviere, N.A., J.E. Riviere. 1995. Enhancing or Blocking Effect of Fenvalerate on the Subsequent Percutaneous Absorption of Pesticides *In Vitro*. Pest. Biomchem. Phys. 51:214-219.

**Unpublished Information**

2418684 USEPA, 2000. Agricultural Transfer Coefficients. Science Advisory Council for Exposure. Policy No. 003.1. Unpublished. 7 August 2000.

## C. Information Considered in the Environmental Assessment

**Studies/Information Submitted By Applicant/Registrant (Unpublished)**

1995688 Schafers, C. (2002). Carbaryl Hazard Potential to Freshwater invertebrates Proposed Ecologically Acceptable Concentration. Unpublished study. M-210735 -01-1

**Additional Information Considered**

**Published Information**

2016893 Havens, K. E. (1995). Insecticide (carbaryl, 1-napthyl-n-methylcarbamate) effects on a freshwater plankton community: zooplankton size, biomass, and algal abundance. Water, Air and Soil Pollution 84: 1-10.

## D. Information Considered in the Value Assessment

**Additional Information Considered**

**Published Information**

2297421 Caldwell, B. et al, 2010, Pesticidal Soap. Resource Guide for Organic Insect and Disease Management - ISBN 0-9676507-2-0 Cornell University Department of Plant Pathology, DACO: 10.6

2041819 Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 2010, Japanese Bettle - Popillia Japonica (Newman), DACO: 10.6

2041817 Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 2010, D-98-09: Comprehensive Policy to Control the Spread of North American Gypsy Moth, Lymantria Dispar in Canada and the United States, DACO: 10.6

2297424 Cranshaw, W. S. 2010, Insect Control: Soaps and Detergents. Insect Series Home and Garden No. 5.547 - Colorado State University Extension, 2008, DACO: 10.6

2041822 IRAC International MoA Working Group, 2010, IRAC MoA Classification Scheme, DACO: 10.6

2041816 Koppert Biological Systems, 2011, Beneficial Nematodes Against Leatherjackets, DACO: 10.6

2297427 Smith, R. et al, 2010, Guidelines for Insecticideal Soap - Washington State University Extension, DACO: 10.6

2297428 Stewart, J.B., 2010, White Grubs in Ontario Lawns.2004. University of Guelph Pest Diagnostic Clinic, Guelph, Ontario. University of Guelph Pest Diagnostic Clinic Factsheet Archive, Insects, DACO: 10.6

2297429 Ubl, J. and C. Munnerlyn, 2010, Insecticidal Soap for Garden Pest Control. 2009. HGIC 2771. Clemson University Extension,

DACO: 10.6